THE CROWDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

J.R.C. COUSLAND

BRILL

THE CROWDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

SUPPLEMENTS TO

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

VOLUME CII



THE CROWDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

BY

J.R.C. COUSLAND



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2002

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Cousland, J. R. C.:
The crowds in the gospel of Matthew / J. R. C. Cousland. – Leiden ;
Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2001
(Supplements to Novum testamentum ; Vol. 102)
Zugl.: St. Andrews, Univ., Diss.
ISBN 90–04–12177–3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 90 04 12177 3

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Dedicated to the memory of James ("Jimmy") William Wishart Thomson

οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις

And to Margaret and all the Thomsons

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III: REX ET GREX

PREFACE

This book had its genesis as a doctoral thesis at the University of St. Andrews, written under the supervision of Professor Ronald Piper. Since completed the thesis, however, my views about the character and role of the crowds have evolved considerably, and the present work offers quite a different assessment from that presented in the dissertation.

My central contention is that Matthew's crowds represent the people of Israel as distinguished from their leaders. The gospel crowds emerge as a theological entity, and the bulk of the book examines them from that perspective. I conclude that while Matthew has categorically broken with the leadership of formative Judaism, he has not fully severed his ties with the Jewish people, and still entertains the prospect of their conversion. It is my hope that the analysis and conclusions offered here will contribute a fresh perspective to the perennial problem of Matthew's relationship to the Judaism of his day.

As this problem continues to be one of the most contentious features of the so-called Matthean "renaissance," I have tried to take account of recent discussion as much as possible. Unfortunately, I did not become aware of Martin Meiser's fine study, *Die Reaktion des Volkes auf Jesus*, until after I had submitted the book for publication.[1] It is encouraging to find, however, that we agree in a number of essentials, even if (inevitably!) not in every respect.

Over the course of writing the dissertation and this book I have had cause to be thankful to a great many people. My family Anne, Ian, Irene and Alastair have provided sustained encouragement and support over the years, for which I am especially grateful. Ron Piper's characteristic insight added much to the dissertation, and in its production I owe a very great deal to the unstinting help of Hugh Scheuermann, as well as to David Whelan, David Leman and Boyne Hill.

In writing the book, I have particularly profited from the percipient advice of James Hume, and I also need to thank Phillip Harding,

---

[1] Martin Meiser, *Die Reaktion des Volkes auf Jesus. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (BZNW 96; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1998). For his discussion of Matthew, see especially pp.223-61.

Christopher Beall and Alan Rawn for their careful reading of the MS and the valuable suggestions they offered. I must also thank my colleagues and the support staff at both the University of Calgary and the University of British Columbia for their ongoing help and encouragement.

Last of all, I need to thank the Thomsons, who made me so much a part of their family when I lived in Scotland; it is to them that this book is dedicated with love and affection.

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations conform to those in Patrick H. Alexander et al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, MA., 1999), with the addition of the following abbreviations. Unless otherwise indicated, citations of classical authors are from the Loeb Classical Library (LCL), citations of the Mishnah from H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford, 1933), citations of the Dead Sea Scrolls from Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco, 1996), citations of the pseudepigrapha from J. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, 1982) and the Babylonian Talmud from the Soncino Edition (London, 1952).

DA	W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* I-III (1988-1997)
EWNT	*Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* I-III (1981-83)
HJP	Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135)* I-III/1-2 (rev. and ed. G. Vermes et al., 1973-87)

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

INTRODUCTION

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER ONE

A *The Nature of the Problem*

Almost 1750 years ago Origen devoted a section of his *Commentarius in Matthaeum*[1] to a discussion of the different roles played by the disciples and the crowds in the Gospel of Matthew.[2] Although Origen did not go on to dilate in detail upon these differences except in a spiritualized sense, his distinction between the two groups remains a characteristically insightful one and raises some questions that have not, as of yet, been definitively resolved. Why is it that Matthew differentiates between the two groups? Who are the crowds, and what role do they have in the Gospel of Matthew? And why has Matthew accorded a prominent place in his gospel to such apparently minor characters?

The intention of this study is to answer precisely these questions. It will identify the crowds and explain their role and function within the gospel. In so doing, it will demonstrate that the crowds are, in fact, not a minor character, but rather are emblematic of the people of Israel as distinct from their leaders. This identification accounts for their prominence within the gospel. To my knowledge, the thesis stated above has not been argued before. Nor has a full-length examination of the crowds been undertaken before, and one is long overdue. The crowds in Matthew have been very largely overlooked by biblical scholars. The following study, therefore, is an attempt to redress this oversight.

Ironically, part of this oversight can probably be attributed to the rise of New Testament scholarship over the last century. After Matthew's erstwhile primacy in the Christian tradition, the two-document hypothesis gave Mark a certain ascendancy. As a consequence, Matthew's crowds have come to be read largely through a Markan lens. Since the crowd(s) feature in many of the same episodes in the

---

[1] Origen, *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, XI.4-5.

[2] Since the plural form of ὄχλος—"crowds"—is found more frequently in Matthew's gospel, this study will use it throughout for the sake of consistency. The name "Matthew" is used in what follows as a convenient designation for the author, without making any claims as to his or her identity. Scriptural passages cited with only chapter and verse are from the Gospel of Matthew. The Appendix at the end of this work includes every verse in Matthew that makes specific reference to the crowds (ὄχλος). The justification for assuming the crowds to be synonymous with the term ὄχλος/οι will be provided in Chapters Two and Four below.

two gospels, it has been natural to suppose that Matthew has simply appropriated the crowd from Mark wholesale, just as he has adopted so much else.[3] Because the crowd in Mark has a relatively minor role, the same assumption has been made of the crowds in Matthew.[4]

Even when the crowds have commanded the attention of scholars, it is safe to say that no consensus has emerged concerning their place in the gospel. Rather, the reverse is true: the spectrum of opinions about the crowds' role, character and function is exceptionally diverse, as even a brief, representative sampling of opinion should make evident. To Vincent Mora, for example, the crowds assume an enormous role in the gospel.[5] To Georg Strecker, by contrast, the crowds constitute nothing more than a "laudatory backdrop to the ministry of Jesus."[6] For Donald Verseput, the crowds are historicized—"wrapped in a cloak of unrepeatability,"[7] and denote only the Jews of Jesus' own day. Yet, for Joseph Comber, "the crowds

---

[3] On the place of the crowd in the Gospel of Mark see: Ernest Best, "The Role of the Disciples in Mark," *NTS* 23 (1977) 390-393; Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Marcan Characters and Readers," *NovT* 28 (1986) 104-130; Paul S. Minear, "Audience Criticism and Marcan Ecclesiology" in H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke (eds.), *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historische Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972) 79-90; A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke," *NTS* 10 (1964) 139-149; David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 134-135; Kenzo Tagawa, *Miracles et évangile: La pensée personelle de l'évangéliste Marc* (Etudes d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 62; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966) 55-73; C. H. Turner, "Notes," 225-240; Osmar Zizemer: *Das Verhältnis zwischen* Jesus *und* Volk *im Markusevangelium* (Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians Universität Munich, 1983).

[4] The same assumption has not been made for the role of the disciples in Matthew simply because it is evident that they are not minor characters. As a result, they continue to garner a fair amount of attention. See, for two recent examples, Richard A. Edwards, *Matthew's Narrative Portrait of Disciples: How the Text-Connoted Reader is Informed* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1997) and Michael J. Wilkens, *Discipleship in the Ancient World and Matthew's Gospel* (2nd Ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995).

[5] Vincent Mora, *Le Refus d'Israël: Matthieu 27, 25* (LD 124; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986) 135.

[6] Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (3. Auf.; FRLANT 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 107. Alexander Sand (*Das Matthäus-Evangelium* [Erträge der Forschung 275; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991] 79) is of a similar opinion: ὄχλος in Matthew is "kein theologisch relevanter Begriff."

[7] Donald J. Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986) 48. See, too, David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (NovTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1979) 38-39.

of the gospel narrative are a cipher for the Jewish people of Matthew's time."[8] Robert Gundry agrees with Comber that they reflect the realities of Matthew's day, but maintains that they are not Jewish, rather, "the masses in the Church...the result of extensive evangelism among the Gentiles."[9]

The same lack of concord is evident in literary evaluations of the crowds as "characters" in the gospel. J. D. Kingsbury claims that, "the crowds...may be dealt with as a single, 'flat' character. They are not rich in traits, and the ones they possess tend not to change until the end of Matthew's story, when they suddenly appear with Judas to arrest Jesus."[10] Clifton Black, however, insists "that the crowds be regarded as rather 'round' characters: albeit [*sic*] their minimalist representation, they are rather lifelike in their unpredictable vacillation and divided loyalty to Jesus."[11]

In short, there is no agreement among these scholars about the crowds in Matthew's gospel. According to these scholars—and their judgements are not unrepresentative—the crowds could be Jewish or gentile, historicized or transparent,[12] and important or relatively minor figures within the gospel framework. While a broad spectrum of opinion is not uncommon within New Testament scholarship, the case of the crowds, with their chameleon-like capacity to fit a variety of interpretations, is out of the ordinary.

The reasons for such a multiplicity of interpretations are not difficult to isolate. Pre-eminent is the fact that the crowds have usually

---

[8] Joseph A. Comber, "The Verb *Therapeuô* in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 97 (1978) 433.

[9] Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 64-65, cf. 8-9. Hans Dieter Betz (*The Sermon on the Mount* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995] 81) similarly describes the crowds as "the pool from which new church members are to be recruited," but does not specify whether he regards these prospective converts as Jews or Gentiles.

[10] Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (2nd Ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 24.

[11] C. Clifton Black II, "Depth of Characterization and Degrees of Faith in Matthew," *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 619. According to Kingsbury (*Story*, 10, and cf. Black, "Depth," 605), "'Round characters' are those who possess a variety of traits, some of which may even conflict, so that their behaviour is not necessarily predictable; round characters are like 'real people'....'Flat' characters are those who possess few traits and are therefore highly predictable in their behaviour."

[12] For the expression "transparent," see Ulrich Luz, "The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew" in G. Stanton (ed.), *The Interpretation of Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1983) 98. The term "transparent" refers to elements in the gospel account that can be understood as allusions to the post-Easter situation of Matthew's community. See, further, the illuminating remarks by Gerhard Lohfink, "Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?," *TQ* 163 (1983) 266#13.

been considered *en passant*. In Matthean scholarship, discussion of the crowds has been made ancillary to other questions because the crowds have generally been regarded, like their Markan counterparts, as marginal figures. An examination of the amount of space usually accorded to them in recent works on Matthew shows that they are often dispensed with in three to four pages at most.[13] And, as these

[13] See *inter alia*: Fred W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew* (Washington: University Press of America, 1981) 404-411; Bernhard Citron, "The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels," *SJT* 7 (1954) 408-18; B. R. Doyle, "'Crowds' in Matthew: Texts and Theology," *Catholic Theological Review* 6 (1984) 28-33; Georg Eichholz, *Auslegung der Bergpredigt* (3. Auf.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1965) 22-24; R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989) 225-27; Garland, *Intention*, 34-41, 210-215; James M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David,'" *NTS* 10 (1964) *passim*; Ulrich Hedinger, "Jesus und die Volksmenge," *TZ* 32 (1976) 201-206; P. Jouon, "ΟΧΛΟΣ au sens de 'Peuple, Population' dans le Grec du Nouveau Testament et dans la *Lettre d'Aristeé*," *RSR* 27 (1937) 618-619; Terence J. Keegan, "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses," *CBQ* 44 (1982) 425-428; Klaus-Stefan Krieger, "Das Publikum der Bergpredigt (Mt 4, 23-25). Ein Beitrage zu der Frage: Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?," *Kairos* 28 (1986) 107-9; David D. Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel. Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel* (SNTSMS 90; Cambridge: University Press, 1996) 67-69; Xavier Leon-Dufour, *Etudes d'Evangile* (Parole de Dieu; Paris: Le Seuil, 1965) 236-238; Richard E. Menninger, *Israel and the Church in the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994) 6-8; Paul S. Minear, "False Prophecy and Hypocrisy in the Gospel of Matthew" in Joachim Gnilka (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974) 78-79; V. Mora, *Refus*, 135-40; Akira Ogawa, *L'histoire de Jésus chez Matthieu: La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie Matthéenne* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1979) 215-222; E. A. Russell, "The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel," *SE* VII=TU 126 (1982) 428-442; Wolfgang Schenk, *Die Sprache des Matthäus: Die Texte-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostructurellen Relationen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) 349-52; Graham Stanton, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," *SBL 1994 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 14-16; Georg Strecker, *Weg*, 106-107, 116, 268#3; Kari Syreeni, *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount* (Pt.1 Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 44; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987) 111-12, 122-4; Raymond Thysman, *Communauté et directives ethiques: La catéchèse de Matthieu. Recherches et synthèses: Exégèse* 1 (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1974) 19-23; Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (3. Auf.; SANT 10; Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964) 72, 75-76; C. H. Turner, "Notes and Studies: Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel, Continued, Pt.V. The Movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd," *JTS* 26 (1925) 225-240; D. J. Verseput, *Rejection*, 46-48; Stephen G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 50. To the above list should be appended the various commentaries on Matthew at 4:25, *passim*, and the following dictionary articles: Horst Balz, "ὄχλος" *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (hereafter *EDNT*) II 553-54; Hans Bietenhard, "People," *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (hereafter *NIDNTT*) II 800-1; Rudolf Meyer, "ὄχλος" *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (hereafter *TDNT*) V 582-90; D. F. Watson, "People, Crowd" in the *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel Green et al. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992) 605-9.

On the place of the crowds in Luke see: Richard Ascough, "Narrative Technique

evaluations of the crowds are, not untypically, subordinated to larger issues, be they Matthew's view of *Heilsgeschichte*, or his community, it is hardly unexpected that the perspectives taken on these larger issues should frequently have coloured the perceptions of the crowds. Apart from a few longer treatments of the crowds, which will be discussed presently, there has been no full-scale analysis of the crowds in Matthew's gospel.

A second reason for such a variety of interpretations is simply that Matthew's depiction of the crowds is decidedly protean. At the root of his portrayal is what can only be described as a fundamental ambivalence or ambiguity, which makes it far from clear how the role of the crowds is to be construed.[14] While this ambivalence is, in some measure, characteristic of the crowds in all of the canonical gospels, it is particularly pronounced in Matthew. The crowds can readily be interpreted both positively and negatively. On the one hand, it is easy to cast them in a favourable light.[15] They generally appear well dis-

---

and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton," *CBQ* 58 (1996) 69-81; Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (5. Auf.; BHT 17; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964) 152-153#1; Paul S. Minear, "Jesus' Audiences According to Luke," *NovT* 16 (1974) 81-109; David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 212-18; A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences," 139-149; R. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, Vol. I (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 143-66; J. B. Tyson, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 30 (1984) 574-83; Paul Zingg, *Das Wachsen der Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974) 61-63.

[14] The word "ambivalence" was first employed by James M. Gibbs ("The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew," *SE* IV=TU 102 (1968) 45#5). Gibbs' observation has since been echoed by a number of studies: Warren Carter, "The Crowds in Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 55 (1993) 58; Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) 114; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Structure of Mt XIV–XVII," *RB* 82 (1975) 376#44; Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) 43; and most recently, Evert-Jan Vledder, *Conflict in the Miracle Stories: A Socio-Exegetical Study of Matthew 8 and 9* (JSNTSup 152. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 232. Horst Balz ("ὄχλος," 554) uses the term "double-mindedness" ("Doppelgesichtigkeit"—*Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1981] II col. 1355) of the crowds in all four gospels. Such ambiguity probably originated in the situation of the historical Jesus, where crowds likely figured both in his ministry and in his arrest and trial.

[15] "Favourable" and "unfavourable" are used evaluatively here and elsewhere to describe the crowds' relation to Jesus. It is safe to assume that, within the framework of the gospel, acceptance of Jesus is construed as a favourable response, and rejection of him a negative response. Cf. R. Alan Culpepper (*Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983] 104), whose remarks about John's gospel are equally apropos for Matthew: "In John's narrative world the individuality of all the characters except Jesus is determined by their encounter with Jesus." See further, J. D. Kingsbury, "The Rhetoric of Comprehension in the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 41 (1995) 364-67.

posed toward Jesus. They are astonished at his words and deeds (7:28; 9:33; 12:23; 15:31; 22:33). They follow him (4:25; 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 21:9), and acclaim him as a prophet (21:11; cf. 21:46), and, more importantly, as the Son of David (21:9; cf. 12:23). Yet, the crowds can just as readily be portrayed unfavourably. They are described by Jesus in chapter 13 as being devoid of understanding (13:10-17). More tellingly, it is they who come later in the gospel to arrest Jesus (26:47), and ultimately join with their leaders in accepting responsibility for his death (27:24-25).

These "Jekyll and Hyde" features sit together uneasily in Matthew's gospel. If the crowds are indeed devoid of understanding at chapter 13, what is to be made of their confession of Jesus as the Son of David during the Triumphal Entry (21:9)? And why should their fundamental insight into Jesus' identity then be followed by a complete *volte-face*, where they take up with their malign leaders and reject him? Such questions are not resolved easily, and the solution that has generally prevailed has been to accentuate either the crowds' favourable or unfavourable traits to the exclusion of the others.[16] On occasion, the crowds are also described as being "neutral," but this is a solution only in name, and its proponents usually forbear to say precisely how the crowds are neutral.[17]

A factor that has further compounded the problem has been the tendency for some scholars to interpret the role of the crowds in light of Matthew's contemporary situation, after paying only cursory attention to the crowds' role at the historical or narrative level of the gospel.[18] It is obvious that such an imbalanced methodology is going to produce skewed results—something that may help to explain why

[16] One exception is the suggestive article by Luise Schottroff—"Das geschundene Volk und die Arbeit in der Ernte Gottes nach dem Matthäusevangeliums" in L. and W. Schottroff, *Mitarbeiter der Schöpfung* (Munich: Kaiser, 1983) 155.

[17] Wilkens (*Discipleship*, 229-30) gives an indication of the difficulties inherent in this approach when he asserts in the same sentence that the crowds are "basically neutral" but "at various times either positively or negatively oriented towards him [sc. Jesus]." Cf., further, Robert Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding* (Waco: Word, 1982) 59 and Krieger, "Publikum," 108, who both also describe the crowds as neutral.

[18] By "historical" I do not refer to a factual relation of events (Von Ranke's history "as it actually happened"), but to Matthew's relation of events, with ἱστορία understood in the sense of "story" or "narrative." Cf. Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition with a revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), s.v. def. II. (hereafter LSJ). That being said, I would agree with Gérard Genette (*Fiction & Diction* [Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1993] 82) that "the two regimes [sc. fiction and nonfiction] are not as far apart…as might be supposed from a distance." The "historical level" then, refers to Matthew's story of Jesus as opposed to the "transparent level," which would refer to

the "contemporary" crowds have been identified both as the Jews of Matthew's own day, and as gentile members of Matthew's community.

Unfortunately, the above difficulties beset even the most influential and extensive studies that have been made of the crowds thus far, those undertaken by J. D. Kingsbury,[19] S. Van Tilborg,[20] Paul Minear,[21] Warren Carter,[22] and Anthony Saldarini.[23] A brief overview of their findings will make this apparent.

B *J. D. Kingsbury*

One of the most influential analyses of the crowds has been that of J. D. Kingsbury in *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction Criticism*.[24] His work argues that "the function of Chapter 13 within the groundplan of Matthew's Gospel is to signal the great 'turning point,'" where Jesus turns away from "the Jews" (including the crowds) to his disciples.[25] The turning point follows upon Matthew's account of Jesus' public ministry (Chapters 4-11) and the increasing animosity with which it is greeted by the "Jews" (Chapters 11-12). In chapter 13 Jesus turns away from them, and decries them as being a

---

the post-Easter situation of Matthew's church. In using the word "level," I follow Raymond E. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984) 125.

[19] Jack D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction Criticism* (London: SPCK, 1969).

[20] Sjef Van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 1972).

[21] Paul S. Minear, "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew," *AThR* Sup. 3 (1974) 28-44.

[22] Carter, "Crowds," 54-67.

[23] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 37-40, 230-32 and *idem*, "Boundaries and Polemics in the Gospel of Matthew," *Biblical Interpretation* 3 (1995) 247. Saldarini's essay—"The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict" in David L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 38-61—is also pertinent.

[24] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 22-92, especially 24-28. Kingsbury's argument has had a considerable impact on Matthean studies. Most recently, Donald Hagner ("Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (*Matthew 13:1-52*)" in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000] 122) echoes Kingsbury's argument that Matthew 13 is "a major turning point in the ministry of Jesus." Kingsbury's study is also quoted with approval by Comber, "Verb," 431; John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad, 1985) 83; David B. Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel* (JSNTSup 42; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 141#2; T. J. Keegan, "Formulae," 423-24, and Dan O. Via, Jr., *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 100, among others.

[25] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 130.

people devoid of understanding. From this point onward he no longer speaks to them openly, but enigmatically in parables. By contrast, he speaks openly to his disciples, the true people of God.[26]

The crowds are an essential component of Kingsbury's schema. They, along with the Jewish leaders, comprise the "Jews." According to Kingsbury, Jesus' attitude toward the crowds undergoes a marked change after chapter 13; Jesus is no longer described as "preaching" to them or "teaching" them after this turning point. The introduction of the word παραβολή in chapter 13, and its frequency thereafter, indicate a deliberate shift to enigmatic speech. Kingsbury further claims that Matthew's use of the word αὐτοῖς as a *terminus technicus* for the crowds also suggests that they are outside of the realm of salvation.

In spite of these features, Kingsbury does recognize that Matthew distinguishes the crowds from their leaders, even in the Passion Account.[27] He maintains that "Matthew is fundamentally well-disposed towards them," especially as he depicts the crowds as sharing directly in the ministry of Jesus.[28] Nevertheless, because the crowds do not belong to the Christian Church, they are to be associated with their leaders.[29]

Kingsbury's argument is effective, cogent and neat—perhaps too neat. The method he employs for defining the crowds is particularly problematic because, in effect, he defines them into perdition. As was just pointed out, Kingsbury acknowledges that Matthew distinguishes the crowds from their leaders, yet he refuses to treat them as distinct entities. The antipathy he remarks in Matthew 11 and 12, which precipitates the "turning point," comes largely from the Jewish leaders and not from the crowds, whose attitude is throughout the two chapters expressly contrasted with that of their leaders (cf. 12:22-24).[30] Nevertheless, Kingsbury conjoins the two groups, designating them as "the Jews." The designation is presupposed throughout his study without any explicit warrant, except for his observation that:

> As it stands, it [sc. this portrayal of the crowds] appears to contradict our findings in chapter 2, where we stated that the crowds in 13.1-35

---

[26] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 16, 130.
[27] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 25-26.
[28] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 26-27.
[29] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 28.
[30] Jean Miler (*Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile de Matthieu* [Analecta Biblica 140; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999] 170#18) observes that the consistency in the gospel's depiction of the crowds makes Kingsbury's supposition implausible.

> represent the whole of unbelieving Judaism and that Jesus' speech in parables to them is essentially a scathing apology provoked by the Jews' rejection of him. But this apparent contradiction resolves itself when we observe that what Matthew in reality does in 13.1-35 is to single out and dwell on only one feature of his description of the Jewish crowds: the fact that they stand beyond the pale of the Church.[31]

Yet, even in these thirty-five verses, Matthew never refers to the "Jews." Kingsbury's usage of the term appears to owe a good deal to John's gospel, as Matthew only uses Ἰουδαίοι once, at 28:15. Here, however, the time frame is different from that of the rest of the gospel—καὶ διεφημίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις μέχρι τῆς σήμερον [ἡμέρας]. The only other place where the crowds are (apparently) joined with their leaders into a "people" (λαός) is at 27:25, though even here they are not called "the Jews."

At first, however, Kingsbury's grouping does not appear overly incongruous because he interprets the crowds in light of the way they are characterized in chapter 13:

> Previously (chaps. 11-12), Jesus was depicted in conflict with only individual segments of the Jewish nation. Now, however, he faces in the crowds the whole of unbelieving Judaism. So it is that Jesus in 13.1-35 vigorously assails the crowds for being *blind, deaf, and without understanding* in regard to the things of salvation (cf. 13.10-13)...In association with chapters 11-12, this apology [sc. 13.1-35] represents the reaction of Jesus to his rejection by the Jews on all sides.[32]

When this passage is considered in detail, however, it does seem incongruous.[33] Why should the crowds be equated with the whole of unbelieving Judaism? Matthew invariably distinguishes them from the Jewish leaders until the Passion Account. Up until then, the crowds, in contrast to their leaders, are largely receptive to Jesus.[34] Hence, Kingsbury is only able to support his definition by ignoring those aspects of Matthew's narrative that do not accord with his interpretation.[35]

---

[31] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 27-28.

[32] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 16. Italics his.

[33] E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies (*Studying the Synoptic Gospels* [London: SCM, 1989] 207), who also single out this passage, suggest that Kingsbury offers an "exaggeration in two directions." First, the gospel gives indications of persecution or expected persecution prior to chapters 11-12, and second, the attitude of the crowds to Jesus vacillates before and after 12:46.

[34] Kingsbury appears to recognize this fact in his later work, *Matthew as Story*, (3): "Until the passion...the crowds are generally well disposed towards Jesus."

[35] Sanders and Davies (*Studying*, 203-20; 221) furnish detailed criticisms of Kingsbury's study, arguing that he "repeatedly" ignores the narrative level of meaning.

In fact, it becomes apparent that Kingsbury's argument works only by conflating the time frames of the historical level of Jesus with the transparent level of the church. His references to 'Jews' and 'Judaism' manifestly relate to the time of the church, but are used to buttress what is, in fact, an argument about Jesus' ministry (i.e., his turning away from the Jews) at the historical level. This is not to deny that Matthew's situation could have influenced his account of Jesus' actions, but Kingsbury approaches the question backwards. Instead of examining the "historical" narrative to determine what it suggests about the relation of Matthew's community to Judaism, he decides in advance what that relation is, and then superimposes it upon Matthew's story.[36] It is for this reason, ultimately, that his 'turning point' theory is flawed.

C *Sjef Van Tilborg*

One study that has emerged with results very different from those of Kingsbury is that by Sjef Van Tilborg: *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. To help to situate the Jewish leadership, Van Tilborg includes discussions of the other two groups in the gospel, the disciples and the crowds. He also explores how these groups interrelate.[37] In his examination of the crowds' relationships with the Jewish leaders, the disciples, and Jesus, he discovers a range of responses. He finds that "the ὄχλοι, in contrast with the Jewish leaders, react very positively in the appearance of Jesus."[38] They approve of Jesus' teaching and recognize how it differs from that of their leaders.[39] The disciples occupy a "special position" with respect to the crowds.[40] They function not only as exemplars but also as mediators of Jesus to the crowds—"they bring the ὄχλοι into contact with Jesus."[41]

For Van Tilborg, Jesus' own relationship to the crowds can be considered a positive one. Jesus' benevolence is manifest in his speaking to and feeding of them, as well as in his compassion and

---

[36] Whether Kingsbury ultimately realizes that this is what he is doing is unclear. In his *Matthew as Story*, with its avowed sensitivity to the story of the gospel (1-2), he is still capable of writing (with reference to 11:2-16:20) that "*Israel's* response to his [sc. Jesus'] ministry is one of repudiation" (77, italics mine). The same view appears unchanged in *idem*, "Comprehension," 364-67.

[37] The disciples are discussed at *Leaders*, pages 99-141, and the crowds at pages 142-65.

[38] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 158.

[39] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 170.

[40] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 163, 171.

[41] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 163, 171.

willingness to heal them.[42] The crowds, in turn, are astonished by him, and come to Jesus of their own volition. They obey him and, more significantly, they "do the same as the disciples have done: they follow Jesus."[43] Their following of Jesus is central to Van Tilborg's depiction of the crowds, because "the following of Jesus is the definition of the essence of being Christian....The ὄχλοι do what they have been asked to do by Jesus."[44]

Van Tilborg goes on to interpret the favourable depiction of the crowds in light of Matthew's contemporary situation:

> Presumably in Mt's time Christ's message did not yet meet with any great resistance. Mt sees how many people have been called to accept Jesus and his doctrine. On the basis of his own actual experiences he believes that also when Jesus was still alive great crowds accepted him. This has become an argument in his eyes to summon others to a similar acceptance.[45]

The crowds in Matthew, therefore, are a retrojection of the later experience of the community, a cipher for the converts in his church.

While it is marked by keen insights—especially his consideration of the crowds in relation to the other characters in Matthew's gospel—Van Tilborg's analysis is wanting in other respects. His assumption, for instance, that the 'great crowds' mentioned in the narrative become adherents of Jesus is, ultimately, rather tenuous. He claims that the crowds are "asked" by Jesus to follow him, but the gospel does not really bear out his contention.[46] In fact, there are strong grounds for supposing that Matthew has Jesus refrain from summoning the crowds to follow him.

A related problem is Van Tilborg's inability to account for the ambiguity in Matthew's depiction of the crowds. Matthew's gospel undoubtedly presents the crowds in a favourable light, and these features are well brought out by Van Tilborg. Yet, he is less successful with the negative traits of the crowds, as instanced by chapter 13 and the Passion Account (27:20-25). In both of these passages, Van Tilborg does recognize Matthew's editorial activity, but attempts to minimize the discordancies.[47] With respect to chapter 13, for example, he candidly admits that the relationship between the crowds and

---

42 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164, 171.
43 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.
44 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.
45 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 171.
46 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.
47 Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 159; 148-149 (on Matt 27:20) and 161-162 (on ch. 13).

the secret-theme taken over from Mark is obscure to him.[48] He is also unable to argue convincingly that Matthew's negative characterization of the crowd in the Passion Narrative, particularly 27:20-25 is determined by pre-Matthean tradition.[49] Thus, his study, although it offers an effective counterbalance to Kingsbury, tends to overlook the negative features of the crowds.

D *Paul S. Minear*

The essay that pioneered discussion of Matthew's crowds in their own right is Paul Minear's "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew."[50] Minear begins by drawing a number of provisional conclusions, the first of which holds that "far from being an amorphous and neutral category, the *ochloi* played a highly positive role as followers of Jesus."[51] He suggests that the crowds constitute a major objective of Jesus' ministry, and that the disciples are especially enjoined to continue the crowd-oriented ministry. Minear notes that the question of the crowds' allegiance forms the basis for the conflict between Jesus and his adversaries.[52] He corroborates part of his portrayal by examining the crowds in relation to the "five great discourses" in Matthew,[53] concluding that the crowds "surely corresponded to the 'laymen' of Matthew's day," while the disciples corresponded to the Christian leaders.[54] In exercising their obligation to care for the laymen, these leaders fulfilled the ministry that Jesus had entrusted to his disciples. Thus, when "the modern reader finds Jesus speaking to the crowds, he may usually assume that Matthew

48 Van Tilborg (*Leaders*, 161) remarks that "Matthew also borrows from Mark the secret-theme and he has strongly elaborated this theme by altering the ἵνα of Mark 4, 12 into the ὅτι of Matthew 13, 13. How this theme should be fitted into the whole of Matthew's concept remains obscure to me, unless the changes in Matthew 13, 10.13 are to be attributed to a pre-Matthean tradition."

49 See the detailed critique of Van Tilborg's position by F. W. Burnett, (*Testament*, 405-409).

50 Minear's study, given its specific focus, is usually treated as one of the standard discussions of the crowds. It is cited, for example, in G. Stanton's extensive survey of Matthean scholarship—"The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980" in W. Haase (ed.), *Auftstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Principat* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985) II 25.3, 1928 (hereafter *ANRW)*.

51 Minear, "Crowds," 31.

52 Minear, "Crowds," 31-32.

53 Minear ("Crowds," 32) finds that the crowds "appear in either the introduction or the conclusion of all five 'sermons' attributed to Jesus, and that in two sermons they form part of his audience (13:1f.; 23:1f.)."

54 Minear, "Crowds," 41.

was speaking to contemporary laymen. When he finds Jesus teaching the disciples, he may usually suppose that Matthew had in mind the vocation of contemporary leaders as stewards of Christ's household."[55]

The difficulty with Minear's position is that he tends to assume the very thing he ought to prove—namely, the highly favourable disposition of the crowds. This is not to deny the crowds' receptivity to Jesus, but Minear's inferences frequently go considerably beyond the evidence. He contends, for instance, that "it is not an exaggeration to speak of the crowds as worshipping Jesus" yet, he never justifies his contention.[56] Minear simply assumes that "since the editor does not show an interest in depicting the steps by which the crowds moved from less to greater faith, we infer that to Matthew the *ochloi* were characterized from the beginning by their acceptance of Jesus' message and his authority as prophet of God."[57]

Minear's summation again makes unwarranted assumptions. He speaks here of "faith" and sees it represented at 8:2 by the words and actions of the leper. It is evident from the leper's remark—"Lord, if you will, you can make me clean" (8:3)—that he does have faith, but is Minear warranted to assume on that basis that the *crowds* have faith, especially when it is never said explicitly of them elsewhere? The προσελθὼν at 8:2 is ambiguous. Does the leper actually emerge from the crowds? Mosaic law speaks against such practice (Lev 13:45-46).

Further, Minear talks of the crowds' "acceptance of Jesus' message" and "his authority as prophet of God"[58] yet, the descriptions of the crowds do not bear out these observations. Certainly the crowds react to Jesus' message—they are astonished by it and they glorify God for giving such authority to men (7:28, 22:33, 9:8)—but they are never expressly depicted as accepting his message. That there is a considerable difference in Matthew between the recognition of Jesus' authority and message, and the acceptance of it is made evident by the pericope of the rich young man (19:16-30). Minear, for his part, assumes that "this acceptance entails at least a modicum of obligation to act in accordance with his disclosure of God's will."[59] It may well be so, but the gospel does not give us any indication that the crowds

---

[55] Minear, "Crowds," 41.
[56] Minear, "Crowds," 30.
[57] Minear, "Crowds," 30.
[58] Minear, "Crowds," 30.
[59] Minear, "Crowds," 30.

did in fact assume this obligation. If anything, it intimates that they did not (12:46-50).

Minear, like Van Tilborg, also fails to account for the crowds' negative portrayal in chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative. He too makes an appeal to the substrate of Mark in chapter 13, though his main argument is to suggest that "*ochloi* had not by Matthew's day become a technical term to which a very specific ecclesiological content adhered."[60] Yet, if—as Minear acknowledges—Matthew is using the word in what is virtually a technical sense for all Jesus' public ministry, why should it not be specific in chapter 13 as well?

Finally, Minear's assumption about the role of the crowds in Matthew's community is poorly substantiated.[61] He asserts that "to the degree that these stories [sc. the feeding narratives] were intended by Matthew to mirror later Eucharists to that same degree the *ochloi* represent the laity in those later gatherings."[62] He begs the question, but he does not answer it. Minear's identification also sidesteps the crowds' negative features. Most notably, how is his view of the laity to be reconciled with the intensification of the crowds' guilt evident at 27:24-25?[63] This difficulty, as with the others mentioned above, reveals deficiencies in Minear's assessment of the crowds.

E *Warren Carter*

The recent essay by Warren Carter is salutary in that it remedies some of the deficiencies of previous studies, particularly their tendency to impose a single role on the crowds. Fundamental is his recognition of the inherent ambiguity of Matthew's portrayal; rather than attempting to force one over-riding tendency onto the crowds, he acknowledges that they are endued with both positive and negative traits. Carter adopts a methodology based on audience-criticism, which, he claims, helps to approximate the reaction of the actual audience of the gospel to the portrayal of the crowds. He determines that the crowds do not play simply one role, but a variety

[60] Minear, "Crowds," 35.

[61] Minear ("Crowds," 42) is aware of possible objections and acknowledges the "hypothetical" nature of his conclusions.

[62] Minear, "Crowds," 31.

[63] Eduard Schweizer (*Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* [SBS 71; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974] 24#64) has grave reservations about Minear's identification: "Noch fraglicher scheint mir die Parallelisierung der Volksmenge mit dem Gemeindegliedern im Unterschied zu den durch die Jünger abgebildeten Leitern...Dagegen spricht schon, dass die Volksmenge in 27,25 sich endgültig gegen Jesus entscheidet."

of roles. They are the objects of Jesus' and later the disciples' ministry. The crowds recognize that God is in some way active in Jesus, but their response falls midway between the faith demonstrated by the disciples and the antipathy characteristic of the Jewish leaders. Ultimately, the crowds' lack of faith prevails when they join with their leaders in assuming responsibility for Jesus' death.[64]

Carter isolates two functions for this portrayal of the authorial audience (and thereby the actual audience). Both are related to mission. The first function is to provide a model for the mission charge of the audience. Like the disciples, the authorial audience are to teach and to heal, to serve the needy, and to demonstrate the mercy and compassion of Jesus. The second function is didactic. The reactions of the crowds are designed to educate the audience about the realities of mission. The crowds' failure to understand Jesus indicates that the mission enterprise is often beset by rejection. On the other hand, the openness of the crowds to Jesus, especially when contrasted with the obduracy of their leaders, offers encouragement to the audience.[65] In short, the authorial audience can expect a mixed reaction to its message. The ambivalence of the crowds corresponds to the situation confronting the gospel's audience: "While the mission commanded by the risen Jesus would more often than not bring negative responses, the assurance was given that the task was not hopeless, that there would also be some positive response."[66]

One inevitable shortcoming of Carter's paper is its brevity. Given the constraints imposed by the essay format, he is forced to paint with a broad brush and deals with some issues too summarily. A case in point is his treatment of the christological title Son of David. He assumes without discussion that "the audience knows" that the crowds' designation of Jesus as the Son of David is inadequate, since the disciples only confess Jesus as "the Son of God."[67] His observation overlooks the fact that Matthew himself sanctions the title Son of David at the outset of the gospel (1:1). Surely, Carter does not mean to imply that the evangelist is himself an unreliable narrator.[68]

A more serious objection emerges from his conclusions. Is the entire portrayal of the crowds to be reduced to a paradigm for mis-

---

[64] Carter, "Crowds," 64.
[65] Carter, "Crowds," 65.
[66] Carter, "Crowds," 67.
[67] Carter, "Crowds," 63. See also, *idem*, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 194.
[68] On the concept of reliable narration, see Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd Ed. Chicago: University Press, 1983) 169-209.

sionary activity? While there is little doubt that Jesus serves as the prime exemplar for missionary service, and that his message provoked a variety of responses, are we to stop there? Carter's analysis says nothing about the crowds from the perspective of Christology or salvation history.[69] What is to be made of the crowds' identifications of Jesus? What of their (otherwise unprecedented) association with their leaders at 27:25? Why do the crowds, who usually appear favourably disposed toward Jesus, ultimately reject him? To say that the crowds simply demonstrate the maxim that "many are called and few are chosen" glosses over too many other questions. Carter's solution, in other words, is too limited.[70]

F *Anthony Saldarini*

Anthony Saldarini does not offer a full-scale discussion of the crowds, but his viewpoint warrants consideration because of its distinctive approach. He furnishes elements of a historico-sociological assessment of the crowds, describing them as "an incipient social movement which had not reached the level of differentiation required for a social movement organization."[71] That is to say, given the crowds' shifting and diffuse character, they lack the type of organization typical of coalitions, reform movements, or political interest groups. Instead, the crowds are "sociologically typical of the lower classes in antiquity."[72] These lower classes were constituted predominantly of artisans and peasants. They were largely illiterate, without social mobility and direct access to power, and because of these deficiencies they were attracted to Jesus' promises of reformed societal relationships.[73]

Unlike some of the authors mentioned above, Saldarini does not consider the crowds to be a distinctive unit. They are "subgroups of Israel," a fact that helps to explain their differing dispositions to Jesus. While they are generally welcoming, certain crowds are marked by their antipathy, such as the crowd that arrests Jesus and the one that

---

[69] By "salvation-history," I mean "a schematic understanding of God's dealings with men that emphasizes continuity-yet-difference." The definition is that of John P. Meier (*Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17-48* [AnBib 71; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976] 22).

[70] It is rather telling that in Carter's substantial book (*Matthew*) he hardly has occasion to mention the crowds, even though a quarter of the book (Chapters 13-16) is dedicated to Matthew's "characters."

[71] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 39.

[72] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38.

[73] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38-39.

condemns him in the Passion Account.[74] In a later essay, however, Saldarini describes Matthew's treatment of the crowds as "consistent" and refers to the crowds as if they were more of a distinctive entity (although this difference may simply be a question of emphasis). There they are described as "Jesus' curious, confused, neutral, misled but seldom hostile audience."[75]

Saldarini also grants the crowds a symbolic dimension. The crowds "symbolize the Jewish community of his [Matthew's] day, which he hoped to attract to his brand of Judaism."[76] Hence, Saldarini would agree with Kingsbury against Van Tilborg and Minear that the crowds are transparent for Jews and not Christian believers. Matthew's community continues to vie for the allegiance of potential Jewish converts.

Saldarini's treatment is most interesting, and the sociological tack he adopts offers refreshing new insights. The chief difficulty with his analysis is its inconsistency. On the one hand, he appears to interpret the crowds in light of the historical and sociological forces operative in Jesus' day. It is not at all evident from his discussion whether the sociological portrait of the crowds he adduces is meant to apply to the crowds surrounding the historical Jesus, whether it is a portrait of Matthew's crowds or whether he even intends to distinguish the two groups.[77] In any event, his approach suggests that he does not discern much material difference between the two. He implies thereby that the portrayal of the crowds is primarily historical and mimetic: that it offers a window into the social forces and classes of the first century C.E.

As will become evident below, there are very good reasons for one to assume that the depiction of the crowds is not historical and mimetic. What makes Saldarini's position even more tenuous is that he also wants to argue that the crowds, when viewed transparently, are symbolic for the Jewish community of Matthew's day. This assumption appears undeniably problematic: the "historical" narrative is mimetic, yet the "transparent" narrative is symbolic. Can he really have it both ways? In addition, he further appears to suggest that the crowds are groups at the "historical" level, but a single group at the transparent level.

---

[74] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38.
[75] Saldarini, "Boundaries," 244.
[76] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38; *idem*, "Boundaries," 244.
[77] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38.

G *Summary*

All told, therefore, the above studies emerge with a variety of fundamental insights. They generally recognize that Matthew characterizes the crowds as a relatively distinct entity, and they have isolated certain typical features of that characterization. They also indicate, either explicitly, or implicitly, that the role of the crowd is relational, and deserves to be interpreted in light of the other groups in the gospel. Significantly, most of the studies agree that the crowds are transparent, even if they offer little in the way of agreement about the crowds' precise identity. These insights are fundamental, and essential to any further appreciation of the role of the crowds in Matthew.

On the other hand, much remains to be done. It is ironic that these more elaborate studies suffer from the same problems that affect the cursory evaluations of the crowds mentioned above. Although they provide more detail, they are still not detailed enough. Three of the studies are not even primarily concerned with the crowds. Kingsbury's work examines the crowds in order to cast light on Matthew 13, Van Tilborg's book considers them to help place the Jewish leaders, while Saldarini is concerned with situating Matthew's community. Only Minear and Carter confine themselves exclusively to the crowds, and their treatments are both just brief essays. Not one of these works considers the utterances or actions of the crowds in any depth, and in Kingsbury's case especially, it has to be asked whether his understanding of Matthew 13 has not, perhaps, unduly coloured his perception of the crowds.

The problems of the crowds' identity and role in the gospel are also accentuated by these studies. That the scholars discussed above emerge with no consensus about the identity or even the basic disposition of the crowds is especially eloquent. So, too, is the fact that their explanations of the crowds' anomalies are not entirely convincing. Kingsbury's interpretation places all the emphasis on chapter 13 and (to a lesser degree) on the Passion Account, while largely discounting the rest of the gospel's narrative. Van Tilborg's and Minear's do precisely the reverse. Carter's study does recognize the essential ambiguity inherent in Matthew's depiction of the crowds, yet his emphasis on the crowds as a template for mission is too reductive.

Finally, a number of the studies are too quick to dismiss the role of the crowds on the historical level, and begin to assess them in light of Matthew's contemporary situation. Kingsbury and Minear are particularly prone to doing so, with neither of them providing an adequate rationale for his identification of the crowds. That the

former comes to identify the transparent crowds as " obdurate Jews" and the latter as "laymen of Matthew's Community" testifies to the problems inherent in their method.[78] John Meier has warned that "there is...a danger in so stressing the second horizon of the church's present state that the horizon of the sacred past is forgotten."[79] His caveat is salutary. Given the prominence of the crowds in the gospel at the historical level, it is obvious that an adequate study of the crowds needs to assess their significance within that framework. It is only when their role at this historical or narrative level has been thoroughly analyzed that it becomes appropriate to consider the crowds in light of Matthew's own situation, if, indeed, one can justly suppose that there is a transparent level or "second horizon."[80]

H *Proposal*

As was indicated above, this study proposes to undertake an analysis of the crowds' identity, role, and function within the gospel. In doing so, it will allow some of the problems just outlined to help dictate its overall format. The above overview has demonstrated that one of the most pressing problems concerns the crowds' identity. Since there is no consensus about the nature and ethnic identity of the ὄχλοι in Matthew, the first section of this study (Chapters 2-4) sets out to identify the crowds at the historical (or narrative) level. It will examine whether it is warranted to consider the crowds as a distinctive entity within the gospel, and then move on to an appraisal of their ethnic identity. The final chapter of the section will consider the relation of the crowds to Israel as a whole.

The second and third sections will address the ambiguity or ambivalence of the crowds' role in the gospel.[81] As this role can readily be divided into "favourable" and "unfavourable" depictions, the first section (Chapters 5-8) will begin with the "favourable"

[78] Nor is this, evidently, an uncommon means of proceeding. Gundry (*Matthew*, 8-9, cf. 64-65) simply informs his readers at the outset of his commentary that "the Jewish crowds symbolize the international church, including the many Gentiles who were later to become disciples." J. C. Fenton *(The Gospel of Saint Matthew* [Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963] 74) does the same: the crowds "foreshadow the members of the Church whom Jesus will heal and teach through his disciples."

[79] Meier, *Law*, 30#13. He is commenting on Minear's study.

[80] These remarks tacitly assume that for the crowds there is a second horizon of the "church's present state," an assumption that would not be held by some of the scholars mentioned above.

portrayal. This is not quite so artificial a means of proceeding as it sounds, since, with the exception of the crowds' involvement in Jesus' arrest and trial, this includes virtually all of the actions, responses and statements made by the crowds in the gospel.[82] The second section will begin, therefore, with an account of Jesus' ministry to the crowds. The next two chapters will analyze their responses to his ministry, including a detailed account of the crowds' "following" of Jesus. The final chapter of the section will examine the significance of the crowds' use of the christological designation Son of David.

The third section (Chapters 9-11) will address the "unfavourable" portrayal of the crowds. It will begin with their description of Jesus as a prophet, and then move to an assessment of the crowds' involvement in Jesus' arrest and trial. The concluding chapter of the section will consider the significance of Jesus' condemnation of the crowds in the Parable discourse (Matthew 13:1-52).

The final section of this work (Chapter 12) will deal with the issue of the crowds' transparency in the gospel. Are—as many of the scholars mentioned above would contend—the crowds transparent for some post-Easter group? If they are, which group do they represent, and what is their role and function?

Taken together, these four sections will demonstrate that the evangelist uses the term ὄχλος (or ὄχλοι) to refer to the Jewish people as distinguished from their leaders. Matthew's ambivalent depiction ultimately arises from his use of two contradictory biblical topoi to characterize the Jewish people in the gospel. On the one hand, he portrays them as a flock, the "lost sheep of the House of Israel," who instinctively receive the ministrations of Jesus, the Son of David. As such, they are needy and responsive to Jesus. On the other hand, Matthew also represents them as the obdurate people of God, who have consistently rejected the prophets sent by him. In the end, Matthew has the crowds reject Jesus, the prophet from Galilee, and join with their leaders in putting him to death. Both of these topoi are familiar from the Hebrew Scriptures, and Matthew uses both to develop different facets of his gospel story. The paradox of the crowds is, in Matthew's view, the paradox of the Jewish people, and is

---

[81] By 'role' I mean in part the "character which one assumes," though in establishing the crowds' 'role,' I would follow Aristotle's discussion of tragedy (*Poetics*, 12-13), which emphasizes the primacy of actions over character within a narrative. This emphasis appears to hold true for the gospels as a whole.

[82] The one notable exception is the crowds' identification of Jesus as a "prophet" (21:11). Why it is included in the third section will be explained more fully in Chapter Nine.

expressive of their ongoing ambivalence toward the God of Israel.

This ambivalence evidently continues unchanged until Matthew's own day. He makes the historical crowds transparent for the Jewish people (as distinct from their leaders), and reveals that despite the church's ongoing mission the Jewish people have not yet accepted its message. The work will go on to consider the function of the crowds in the gospel, and offer some suggestions as to why Matthew might have chosen to portray them in such a fashion.

Taken as a whole, an appropriate understanding of the place of the crowds in Matthew's gospel should provide a new point of departure for (re-) assessing Matthew's relation to Judaism, his Christology, and his *Heilsgeschichte*. The first of these issues is in particular need of elucidation. Stanton has justly observed that "for much of early Christianity, and for Matthew in particular, the relationship between Christianity and Judaism was the central problem for Christian theology."[83] This study will help to establish how Matthew attempts to resolve the problem.

H *Presuppositions and Methodology*

The above analysis suggests the need for a method that will address both the historical and transparent levels of the gospel. Accordingly, the following examination will employ an eclectic methodology that combines elements of redaction criticism with insights derived from narrative criticism.[84] This approach will treat some of the literary features of the gospel without discounting issues of the evangelist's sources and the possibility of extra-textual referents.[85] Given, how-

---

[83] Stanton, *New People*, 168. See further Donald Hagner, "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel of Matthew" in David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell (eds.), *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996] 63), and, most recently, Donald Senior "Between Two Worlds: Gentile and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 61 (1999) 1-23 and Douglas R. A. Hare, "How Jewish Is the Gospel of Matthew?" *CBQ* 62 (2000) 264-77. Senior remarks that there is a scholarly consensus that "Matthew's interface with Judaism…is the fundamental key to determining the social context and theological perspective of this gospel" (p. 5).

[84] This approach is similar to that advocated by Ulrich Luz in *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995) 1-10.

[85] It goes without saying that Matthew's crowds could be fruitfully approached from a variety of other methodological points of view; see, for instance, the recent social-scientific examination by Jerome Neyrey (*Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998] 42-44), who shows how the crowds are, among other things, utilized by the evangelist to enhance Jesus' status: "by brokering God's benefactions to the people, Jesus has earned their respect and achieved great honour" (p. 44).

ever, the increasing prominence of narrative criticism in recent gospel studies and the fact that redaction criticism has come to be regarded in certain circles as a "*Sackgasse*," it may justly be asked why redaction criticism has not been dispensed with entirely in favour of narrative criticism.[86]

One reason for not dispensing with redaction criticism is that it remains an essential tool for analyzing Matthew.[87] The chief objections to redaction criticism have been levelled against the method's application to the Gospel of Mark.[88] There, given the absence of concrete criteria for assessing the scope and character of Mark's editorial activity, the method has indeed proved to be something of a dead end.[89] An acceptance of the two-document hypothesis, however, does provide Matthean scholars with precisely these criteria for Matthean studies. The method's continued effectiveness is attested by the fact that, with a few exceptions, all of the recent commentaries on Matthew subscribe to the two-document hypothesis and make use of the insights afforded by redaction criticism.[90] Given this practical evidence for its viability, the method (with its implicit reliance on the two-document hypothesis) will be drawn upon here as well.

---

[86] See John R. Donahue, "Redaction Criticism: Has the *Hauptstrasse* become a *Sackgasse*?" in E. V. McKnight and E. Struthers Malbon (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994) 27-57.

[87] Graham Stanton, in a chapter entitled "Redaction Criticism: the End of an Era?" (*A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992] 23-53), has stressed the viability and essential insights provided by redaction criticism.

[88] Donahue, "*Hauptstrasse*," 39-41.

[89] Though see the reservations by Franz Neirynck, "Literary Criticism: Old and New" in Camille Focant (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (BETL 110; Leuven: University Press, 1993) 36-7.

[90] Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew* (The New American Commentary 22; Nashville: Broadman, 1992) 37-41; D. A. Carson, *Matthew* (The Expositors Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995) 11-17; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, 3 Vols. (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997) I 97-127; (hereafter DA); David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1993) 3-4; J. Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2 Vols. (HTKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1986,1988) II 526; Donald Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* and *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33A-B; Dallas: Word, 1993, 1995) cf. *Matthew 1-13*, xlvi-xlviii); Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1993) 2; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina I; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1991) 5-7; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989) 46-49; Donald Senior, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Interpreting Biblical Texts; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997) 22-24. One exception is Craig S. Keener (*A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999] 1-16), whose commentary is largely social-historical and rhetorical. Yet, even he draws on redaction criticism and the two-document hypothesis (pp. 2-3,13).

Just as clearly, however, it needs to be supplemented. Redaction criticism has been faulted for promoting in its practitioners a failure to appreciate the artistic unity and integrity of the gospels, and their literary characteristics.[91] This observation certainly holds true for treatment of Matthew's crowds. While they are major characters within the gospel, and their story one of its narrative threads, previous redaction-critical studies have very largely overlooked these factors, devoting inordinate attention instead to the question of the crowds' transparency. A consideration of the crowds from a narrative and literary perspective, therefore, has much to offer.[92]

That being said, pure narrative criticism is in certain respects also unsuited to the present examination. While the narrative-critical method has proved invaluable in highlighting the story-line of the gospel, it tends to promote in its exponents an overvaluing of the narrative quality of the gospel. A number of the recent narrative-critical studies devoted to Matthew appear to presuppose that the gospel is exclusively a narrative or story about Jesus,[93] a story often regarded as generically akin to the ancient *bios*.[94]

Without doubt, the Gospel of Matthew does furnish a story of Jesus, and has very considerable points in common with the *bios* genre.[95] Yet, despite these areas of overlap, it is doubtful whether Matthew is a *bios* (or narrative) pure and simple. The proportion of

---

[91] Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 1-2.

[92] For narrative-critical approaches that discuss the crowds, see David R. Bauer, "The Major Characters of Matthew's Story," *Int* 46 (1992) 363-65; Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 24-25. By narrative I mean "the representation of real or fictive events and situations in a time sequence." The definition is that of Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative* (Janua Linguarum 108; Berlin: Mouton, 1982) 1.

[93] See, for instance, D. J. Weaver (*Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis* [JSNTSup 38; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990] 23), who contends that "downplaying the significance of the narrative framework…does violence to Matthew's own intentions." Her certainty about Matthew's "intentions" begs the question of genre, and somewhat vitiates the findings of an otherwise valuable study. Cf., in addition, Margaret Davies, *Matthew* (Sheffield; JSOT Press, 1993) 1; Edwards, *Portrait*, 1; Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story*, 249. Mark Allen Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 44-50; Gary Yamasaki, *John the Baptist in Life and Death: Audience-Oriented Criticism of Matthew's Narrative* (JSNTSup 167; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 11.

[94] Carter, *Matthew*, 46-8.

[95] Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS 70; Cambridge: University Press, 1992); Philip Schuler, *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); Graham Stanton, "Matthew: βίβλος, εὐαγγέλιον, or βίος?" in F. Van Segbroeck et al. (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL 100; Leuven: University Press, 1992) Vol. 2 1187-1201.

teaching to narrative in Matthew is so considerable that it necessarily calls such a judgement into question. It is true that there are *bioi* containing extended discourses—Lucian's *Demonax* and Plutarch's *Life of Cato the Elder* are often cited[96]—yet, when one examines the proportion of teaching in Matthew and compares it to these ancient *bioi*, pronounced differences emerge. According to the figures provided by Burridge, 42.5%—approaching half—of Matthew is made up of Jesus' teaching.[97] *Demonax*, by contrast, has less than half of Matthew's proportion of teaching—19.7%, while the discourses in the *Life of Cato the Elder* 7-9 are very limited indeed.[98] These parallels are not sufficient to suggest that the genre of Matthew is the *bios* alone; rather, it is preferable to recognize that the gospel is a composite genre, part *bios* and part *didachê*.[99] If, however, Matthew is a composite genre of this kind, including significant non-narrative elements, the applicability of narrative-criticism to the gospel as a whole is compromised.[100]

This problem can be seen in the difficulties that narrative-critical studies have often had in fully incorporating the Matthean discourses.[101] Matthew, unlike Luke, has highlighted Jesus' teaching by assembling discourses instead of simply interspersing Jesus' teaching throughout the gospel.[102] Yet, given their prominence—31.5% of the gospel, according to Burridge's estimate[103]—the discourses have been proportionally undervalued by some narrative critics.[104] Stanton

96 Stanton, "βίος," 1201.

97 Burridge, *Gospels*, 272. Burridge provides the following percentages for the other gospels: Luke is 36.8% teaching, John 34% and Mark 20.2% (pp. 271,273-4).

98 Burridge, *Gospels*, 270.

99 Dale C. Allison ("Matthew: Structure, Biographical Impulse and the *Imitatio Christi*" in Van Segbroeck et al., *The Four Gospels*, 1209) has noted that "Matthew is several things at once: it mixes genres. But included in that mixture…is biography."

100 This issue is especially pertinent to our study, as the Parable discourse has considerable bearing on the place of the crowds. See below Chapter Eleven.

101 Stanton,"βίος," 1201#58.

102 John Riches (*Matthew* [New Testament Guides; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996] 35) remarks: "it seems strange to suggest that Matthew is *exalting* narrative over discourse, when he has taken such care in the construction of his major discourse sections" (italics his).

103 Burridge, *Gospels*, 197.

104 Christopher R. Smith ("Literary Evidences of a Fivefold Structure in the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 43 (1997) 540-51) and Janice Capel Anderson ("Matthew: Sermon and Story" in Bauer and Powell, *Treasures*, 233-50) are notable exceptions. Smith remarks that "if Matthew is 'most obviously' a story, it is a rather dull one for several long stretches, while the disciples basically sit around while Jesus talks" (p. 541). The book by Warren Carter and John Paul Heil—*Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives* (CBQMS 30; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998)—also attempts to integrate the discourse material.

complained of this neglect almost a decade ago, and the situation has been slow to change.[105]

Finally, the focus of the present study moves beyond the ambit of narrative criticism. As the above survey has indicated, much of the scholarly interest in the crowds has concentrated on their transparent role in the gospel—how the crowds cast light on the evangelist's own circumstances. Yet, as Carter has recently explained, narrative criticism does not address the question of extra-textual figures.[106] Because the final section of this study will address the question of the transparent crowds, it is necessary to employ a method that allows for the possibility of extra-textual figures. Here an approach that is not based on narrative criticism commends itself.

For these reasons, an eclectic method makes good sense. The one outlined above should prove effective for an analysis of Matthew's crowds, while avoiding some of the pitfalls associated with using either redaction or narrative criticism in isolation.

---

[105] Stanton ("βίος," 1201#58). For a penetrating assessment of the limitations of narrative criticism, see John Ashton, *Studying John. Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 141-165.

[106] W. Carter, "Narrative/Literary Approaches to Matthean Theology: The 'Reign of the Heavens' as an Example (Mt. 4.17-5.12)," *JSNT* 67 (1997) 8; cf. Howell, *Matthew's Inclusive Story*, 250.

This page intentionally left blank

PART II

THE IDENTITY OF THE CROWDS

Given the very divergent approaches that have been taken toward the crowds in the first gospel, it is imperative that they be examined afresh. The following three chapters, therefore, set out to examine their identity in considerable detail. Chapter Two considers whether it is warranted to regard the crowds as a distinctive entity within the gospel. Chapter Three investigates the ethnic identity of the crowds, while Chapter Four examines the relation of the crowds to the people of Israel.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWO

A *Matthew's Sources*

As the last chapter made evident, one of the most fundamental questions concerning the crowds in Matthew is their identity. Before this can be established, however, it needs to be asked whether such an enterprise can even be undertaken. While the studies by Minear and the scholars mentioned above do seem to suggest that the crowds represented a distinctive entity within the gospel, it is safe to say that the issue would profit from a more concerted examination.[1] Accordingly, the first part of this chapter will begin with a discussion of Matthew's terminology for the crowds. It will then present a detailed evaluation of Matthew's descriptions of, and ascriptions to, the crowds in his gospel. The second part of the chapter will consider these changes in more detail to ascertain the distinctive features of the Matthean portrayal of the crowds.

Before doing either, however, it is necessary to address the question of Matthew's sources. Where does Matthew come by his references to the ὄχλος or ὄχλοι?[2] Do they occur in his sources, and, if so, which ones?

The word ὄχλος itself occurs more frequently in Matthew than in either Mark or Luke.[3] Matthew appears to have drawn at least two of

---

[1] Minear ("Crowds," 35), for instance, actually posits two crowds, since he is unwilling to identify the crowds of the Passion Narrative with the crowds of Jesus' public ministry.

[2] As ὄχλος is, by far, Matthew's preferred designation for the crowds, this discussion will begin with it, and consider the question of related terms below.

[3] Matthew—50, Mark—38, Luke—41. See Kurt Aland et al. (eds.), *Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, Band II *Spezialübersichten* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) s.v. Robert Morgenthaler (*Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* [3. Auf.; Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1982] 127), by contrast, emerges with only 49 references, probably because he omits 12:15, which has variant readings (πολλοί B *pc* lat / ὄχλοι N* / ὄχλοι πολλοί C D L W Θ (^{s} 0233 *pc*) 0281 $f^{1.13}$ 33, 892, 1006, 1342, 1506, ˜ f h (q) sy$^{p.h.}$ sa^{ms}bo and the Majority text). Although B. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2nd Ed; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/ United Bible Societies, 1994] 26) does not incline to the view, it is still preferable to assume that ὄχλοι dropped out by homoioteleuton at 12:15 than to regard it as a later addition. Metzger observes that the presence of ὄχλοι πολλοί at 4:25; 8:1; 13:2; 15:30 and 19:2 may have influenced the scribes, but his argument cuts both ways, since this would be the only instance in the gospel where Matthew refers to the crowds as πολλοί. Nor is the reading of πολλοί here at all dependent on Mark 3:7 (πολὺ πλῆθος). One might further add that the reading of πολλοί at 12:15 also runs

these references from Q.[4] The first is a passage (// Luke 11:14-15) that he has incorporated into his gospel twice, once at 9:32-34, and a second time at 12:22-24. The reaction of the crowds to Jesus' wonder-working at 9:33 is identical with Luke 11:14: "the mute spoke and the crowds marvelled" (ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι),[5] while 12:23 is a paraphrase (καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι).[6] Given the verbal agreement between Luke 11:14 and Matthew 9:33, it is probable that the crowds in this instance were mentioned in Q.

Much the same can be said for Jesus' address to the crowds about John the Baptist (Matt 11:7-11 // Luke 7:24-28). Both Matthew and Luke state that Jesus "began to speak to the crowds concerning John." While there are one or two slight variations between the two accounts—Luke has λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους where Matthew has τοῖς ὄχλοις—they are minor, and do not really call the crowds' presence into doubt.[7]

Apart from these two instances, Matthew does not appear to have appropriated any other occurrences of the word ὄχλος from Q. It is, of course, entirely possible that there were no other occurrences of the word. Although Matthew has not included them, passages such as Luke 7:9 and Luke 12:54 do mention the crowds and have partial parallels in Matthew. Should the inclusion of the crowds be ascribed to Luke, or has Matthew simply chosen to eliminate them?

How difficult a question this can be may be determined from a third instance, where Luke mentions the crowds and Matthew does not. The passage in question is Luke 3:7-9 // Matt 3:7-10, an

---

counter to Matthew's tendency to identify his subject. As E. P. Sanders observes (*The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* [SNTSMS 9; Cambridge: University Press, 1969] 183), "Matthew is clearly the most specific Gospel in the category of making the subject of a sentence or clause explicit." For a list of these changes, consult Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: with a cumulative list* (BETL 37; Leuven: University Press, 1974) 261-264.

The textual tradition of 8:18 is also diverse, but all the variant readings include ὄχλοι or ὄχλος: πολλοὺς ὄχλους[2] C L Θ f^{13} 0233, 892, 1006, 1342, 1506, ˜ lat syr[h.] the Majority text; πολὺν ὄχλον([s] W *pc* c g[1]) W 1424 *al* sa[ms] mae; ὄχλους̊ * f^{1} *pc* bo ὄχλος B sa[mss].

[4] For the purposes of this discussion, I assume that Q was a source common to Matthew and Luke written in Greek. For a justification of this position, see John Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 41-64.

[5] Cf. the related narrative in Mark 3:22-26, which does not, however, contain any mention of the crowd.

[6] Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: Mt 8-17* (EKKNT 1/2; Zurich: Benziger, 1990) 63.

[7] See John Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988) 54.

account of the message of the Baptist. It is an important instance because it may shed light on Matthew's first mention of the crowds. The introduction to the passage is notably different in the two gospels.[8] At Luke 3:7, John the Baptist derides "the crowds that came out (τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις) to be baptized by him" as a "brood of vipers," while Matthew has John berate "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism" (Matt 3:7). Given the discrepancy between the two accounts, it is possible that Matthew has diverged from Q and replaced the crowds with the Pharisees and Sadducees. Since, however, the discrepancies between the two introductory passages in Matthew and Luke are considerable, it is more likely that each evangelist composed his own introduction to the Q pericope.[9] The same could probably be said for the other two passages mentioned above, namely, that Luke has added the references to the crowds.[10] Hence, in all probability, Matthew has adopted only two references to the crowds from Q, and used one of these references twice. What then of Matthew's so-called M source?

To begin with, the "M" source is best regarded not as a putative single document, as Streeter conjectured,[11] but as an amalgam of discrete sources (written and/or oral).[12] Further, it is unlikely that any of the sources making up this amalgam contained an explicit mention of the crowds. All the references to the crowds that are found in the passages unique to Matthew can be plausibly explained as Matthean editorial creations.[13] Significantly, no reference is made to the crowds

---

[8] Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 10; Athanasius Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979) 29.

[9] William Arnal, "Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist's Preaching in Q 3:7-9, 16-17" in J. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995) 167-68; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981) 464.

[10] For Luke 7:9, see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 48-50. For 12:54, cf. John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas: Word, 1993) 712; Moessner (*Banquet*, 111-14) explains in detail why Luke has given prominence to crowds at this point in his gospel.

[11] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930) 235.

[12] For an overview of these materials, see DA I 124-27.

[13] If one takes Streeter's (*The Four Gospels*, 198) extensive list of passages "peculiar to Matthew" as representative, only 4:25; 5:1; 7:28; 8:1; 9:33,36; 12:23; 15:30-31; 21:11; 22:33; 23:1; 27:24 mention the crowd(s). Davies' and Allison's (DA I 122-24) list is similar, except, that they include 13:36 as well. Davies and Allison rightly consider every one to be Matthean, with the sole exception of 27:24-25. Yet, even this passage is probably redactional, as it contains a number of Mattheanisms (cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 565 and Hans Klein, *Bewährung im Glauben: Studien zum Sondergut des Evangelisten Matthäus* [BThSt 26; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1996] 23-4).

in the long narrative blocks unique to Matthew (e.g., chapters 1-2; 17:24-27; 27:3-10, 62-66; 28:9-20). Where the crowds do appear, it is most commonly at the beginning or end of pericopae, which suggests that they are editorial additions. Matthew is not indebted to "M" for any of his uses of the word.

Matthew's chief source is, without doubt, the Gospel of Mark. Yet, even here, Matthew is not so reliant on his *Vorlage* as one might expect. Considering the fact that the word ὄχλος occurs fifty times in Matthew and thirty-eight times in Mark, one would anticipate finding most of Mark's occurrences of the word in Matthew. Surprisingly, this is far from the case. Just over half of Mark's uses of the word, some twenty in all, have been omitted;[14] Matthew retains Mark's ὄχλος only eighteen times.[15] Nevertheless, as Matthew's indebtedness to his source extends over most of the gospel, Mark's influence is not inconsiderable.

Matthew appears to have retained Mark's crowd where they are prominent in the narrative. This is usually when the crowds are singled out as the express recipients of Jesus' activity, or when they contribute to the advancement of the story of Jesus. The clearest examples of the former are the feeding narratives (Mark 6:34,45; 8:2,6*bis*), and those instances where Jesus specifically addresses the crowd (Mark 3:32; 4:1*bis*; 7:14). The second category is particularly prominent in the Jerusalem narrative, where the crowd is used to explain the leaders' reluctance to move against Jesus (Mark 11:32; 12:12; cf. Mark 12:37). Ultimately, their involvement in Jesus' Passion is also described (Mark 14:43; 15:11), and Matthew also retains Mark's crowd in healing accounts such as Mark 9:14 and 10:46, which feature the crowd in a subordinate role. To these accounts should also be added several pericopae where the crowd is mentioned by both Matthew and Mark, but at different points in the narrative (cf. Matt 9:1-8 // Mark 2:1-12).

To summarize the above findings, Matthew apparently relies on only two sources, Mark and Q, to develop his portrayal of the ὄχλοι. Drawing on Mark for some eighteen references, and Q for two, Matthew uses them to serve as the foundation for his depiction of the crowds. Yet, just as clearly, the superstructure he constructs is his own. Fully thirty of Matthew's references to the ὄχλοι are editorial.

---

[14] Mark 2:4; 2:13; 3:9; 3:20; 5:21; 5:24; 5:27; 5:30; 5:31; 7:17; 7:33; 8:1; 8:34; 9:15; 9:17; 9:25; 11:18; 12:41; 15:8; 15:15.

[15] Matthew has retained Mark 3:32; 4:1(*bis*); 4:36; 5:38; 6:34; 6:45; 7:14; 8:2; 8:6(*bis*); 9:14; 10:1; 10:46; 11:32: 12:12; 12:37; 14:43; 15:11.

B *Use of the term ὄχλος in Matthew*

Given that Matthew's reliance on Mark for the term ὄχλος is determinative for his portrayal, it has not been deemed necessary to examine the history of the term prior to Mark's appropriation of it. In fact, the sense of the word as it is found in Matthew and Mark does not differ appreciably from usages typical of the larger Greco-Roman world. Liddell and Scott, for instance, define ὄχλος, as, among other things, a "crowd," "throng," "mass" or "multitude."[16]

In Matthew's gospel, ὄχλος signifies a "crowd, throng, (multitude) of people," and also, "the (common) people, populace."[17] The two senses here, while distinct, do tend to shade into one another. This can be seen, for instance, in a comparison of 21:26 with 21:46. The first passage presumably refers to the crowds immediately present, while the second refers to the populace in general.[18] Both verses, however, are structured in a similar way, and the role of the crowds is virtually identical. So, while there is a distinction between crowd and populace, it does not always have currency for Matthew. Increasingly, as will be shown below, the crowd functions, *pars pro toto*, for the populace.

Matthew uses ὄχλος in conjunction with a number of qualifiers to produce a variety of nuances: ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὄχλος πολύς, πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι, πλεῖστος ὄχλος. By far the most common usage, however, is ὄχλος unqualified, either in the plural (most frequently) or the singular.[19]

---

[16] LSJ s.v. ὄχλος. They also include other definitions less germane to the gospel such as "camp followers," or, in an entirely different sense, "annoyance" or "trouble."

[17] Respectively definitions one and two of Bauer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. W. Danker (2nd Ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), hereafter BAGD, s.v. ὄχλος. Their third and fourth definitions are uncharacteristic of Matthew. He does not use ὄχλος with the genitive (3), nor does he use it as a synonym for ἔθνος (4). On ἔθνος in Matthew, see G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946) 117-120.

[18] Thus BAGD s.v. ὄχλος.

[19] The distribution of the various expressions is as follows:
ὄχλοι πολλοί: (6x) 4:25; 8:1; 12:15 (*v.l.*); 13:2; 15:30; 19:2.
πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι (1x) 12:23
πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος(1x) 13:2b
πολὺν ὄχλον (attrib.) (1x) 14:14
ὄχλος πολύς (2x) 20:29; 26:47
πλεῖστος ὄχλος(1x) 21:8
ὄχλος (singular and plural: 38x) 5:1; 7:28; *8:18*; 9:8; *9:23*; *9:25*; 9:33; 9:36; 11:7; 12:46; 13:34; 13:36; *14:5*; 14:13; 14:15; 14:19; 14:19b; 14:22; 14:23; *15:10*; *15:31*; *15:32*; *15:33*; *15:35*; 15:36; 15:39; *17:14*; *20:31*; 21:9; 21:11; *21:26*; 21:46; 22:33; 23:1; 26:55; *27:15*; 27:20; *27:24*. The italicized verses have ὄχλος in the singular.

Do these differences in terminology reflect an actual difference in signification? Recently, Schenk has proposed that the crowds consist of discrete entities.[20] He contends that the recurring use of ὄχλοι πολλοί without the article signals the appearance of a new and distinct group six times within the gospel.[21] The other occurrences of ὄχλος with the article are anaphoric and refer back to the most recent mention of "great crowds."

While Schenk's argument would help to account for some of the anomalous behaviour of the crowds, it is not entirely plausible. For instance, at 8:1 Matthew relates that great crowds followed Jesus, a datum that leads Schenk to claim that "a new group" is signified here.[22] Yet 7:28, which is only separated from 8:1 by one verse (7:29), also mentions the crowds—but not "great crowds"—who are amazed at Jesus' teaching. Can it be that Matthew is really distinguishing between one set of crowds at 7:28 and a new set introduced in the very next verse but one? The group at 8:1 is in no way different from the preceding group—both are described as following Jesus (8:1; 4:25). What possible reason would Matthew have for differentiating between the two?

Elsewhere Schenk attempts to distinguish between the crowds on the basis of their adherence to Jesus as demonstrated in their "following" of Jesus, and on the basis of location. Ultimately, neither consideration is particularly compelling. It will be demonstrated more fully below that the "following" of Jesus by the crowds does not indicate nascent discipleship or, for that matter, any formal commitment to Jesus. And, while Matthew does make a very few geographical references in relation to the crowds (e.g., Jericho at 20:29), Schenk puts far too much weight on them. His description of the crowds at 13:2 as the "Capernaumite audience" is a case in point.[23] Matthew says nothing about Jesus being in Capernaum at this juncture. Schenk has had to import the location on the basis of passages from Mark (Mark 2:1 with Mark 3:20)—passages that Matthew has not even included in his gospel. The very fact that Matthew has

---

[20] Schenk, *Sprache*, 349.

[21] The expression ὄχλοι πολλοί is generally conceded to be characteristic of Matthew (Matt 6 Mark 0 Luke 2). Cf. M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974) 483 and Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968) 316. Nigel Turner (J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. IV, *Style* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976] 43) observes that ὄχλοι πολλοί "is Matthew's idiom for *a great crowd* and is not to be understood of separate groups."

[22] Schenk, *Sprache*, 350.

[23] Schenk, *Sprache*, 350: "kafarnaitische Zuhörerschaft."

eliminated such references should counsel against placing undue emphasis on location as a basis for distinguishing between crowds. In sum, therefore, there is no compelling reason for supposing that the crowds are comprised of a large number of discrete groupings. Instead, the gospel seems to suggest that the crowd is largely homologous in constitution.

C *Singular Crowds?*

What is somewhat more perplexing is Matthew's apparently indiscriminate vacillation between the singular and plural ὄχλοι. Matthew's preference is for the plural form (31/50), while Mark uses the plural only once (Mark 10:1 // Matt 19:2 [pl.]), or as some would argue, not at all.[24] Matthew follows Mark's use of the singular in nine out of seventeen cases (or ten of eighteen if Matt 8:18 // Mark 4:36 is included). Matthew has added the plural some twenty-two times.

As these findings suggest, Matthew's use of the plural is idiosyncratic, if not erratic. One possible explanation for the predominance of the plural as opposed to Mark's characteristic use of the singular is that it is christological; its usage reflects Matthew's inclination to make the crowds about Jesus as large and as significant as possible.[25] At the same time it appears that Matthew has not carried this out with any degree of rigour, as can be seen, for instance, in Matthew 15:29-39, a Matthean healing summary (15:29-31), which he has conjoined to the episode of the feeding of the four thousand (15:32-39). Both 15:30 and 31 are editorial insertions, with 15:30 being plural and 15:31 singular. As Matthew is describing the same group in each instance, and his dependence on Mark here is slight,[26] one would have expected him to continue with the plural.[27] Yet, he does not. He unaccountably shifts from the plural to the singular.

The same difficulty appears in the account of the feeding of the four thousand. This time, however, Matthew, having begun with the singular (Matt 15:32 sing. // Mark 8:2 sing.), and continued with the

---

[24] R. H. Lightfoot (*History and Interpretation in the Gospels* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935] 39#1) argues that "it may be said with confidence that St. Mark never uses ὄχλος in the plural. In [Mark] 10:1, the only apparent exception, the singular should probably be read."

[25] E. Lohmeyer and W. Schmauch (*Das Evangelium des Matthäus* [Meyer Kommentar; 4. Auf.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967] 77#1) detect "einer glorifizierende Tendenz."

[26] Matthew has apparently reworked the healing of the deaf-mute (Mark 7:31-37) into a generalized healing summary.

[27] Some manuscripts (B L W sy[c.p.h.] mae lat and the Majority text) resolve the difficulty by putting 15:31 in the plural as well.

singular (Matt 15:33 no //; 15:35 // Mark 8:6), once more moves to the plural at 15:36 (15:36 pl. // Mark 8:6 sing.). As with the passage above, the same group is being described. Further, the verses in Mark upon which Matthew is reliant have the singular in each instance.[28] Why Matthew should suddenly shift to the plural is obscure to say the least.

Minear has suggested that the singular is indicative of Matthew's incorporation of material from Mark,[29] but Matthew does not adhere to this pattern with sufficient frequency for it to be an instructive distinction. T. J. Keegan has proposed a more far-reaching *discrimen*: "whenever Matthew uses the plural, he wants to designate the crowds in the technical sense as the object of Jesus' (and the disciples') ministry."[30] He goes on to suggest that "every use of the singular is either found in traditional material and lacking special significance for Matthew or is used by Matthew in a clearly non-technical sense."[31] One must question the legitimacy of Keegan's criteria here. If, as his sentence appears to imply, some of the occurrences lack "special significance" by virtue of being traditional material, his view must be gainsaid.

Nor, for that matter, is the distinction always valid, as can be adjudged from his treatment of 13:2a and 13:2b: "And great crowds (ὄχλοι πολλοί) gathered about him [sc. Jesus], so that he got into a boat and sat there; and the whole crowd (πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος) sat on the beach." Keegan attempts to distinguish ὄχλοι πολλοί (13:2a) from πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (13:2b) by appealing to Matthew's structure, claiming that the "conclusion to be drawn from the plural and singular in Matthew 13:2a and 2b is not that there is no difference in meaning but that it is the occurrence in 13:2a and not in 13:2b that is of structural significance for Matthew."[32] Are the crowds to be regarded as the object of Jesus' ministry in only one of these instances? It certainly would seem unlikely. Although it would have been a helpful distinction, Keegan is unable to support his position. It is best, therefore,

---

[28] There are a number of harmonizing textual variants. Some authorities have crowds in the plural at 15:33 (τοὺς ὄχλους C $892^{c.}$ 1010. 1424 *al*; τοῖς ὄχλοις L W and the Majority text), while a considerable number have the singular (τῷ ὄχλῳ) at 15:36 (C D W Θ lat $sy^{h.}$ sa^{mss} mae and the Majority text).

[29] Minear, "Crowds," 29.

[30] Keegan, "Formulae," 425-426. B. R. Doyle ("'Crowds' in Matthew," 29) makes a similar point.

[31] Keegan, "Formulae," 426.

[32] Keegan, "Formulae," 426: here he again discounts Matthew's inclusion of the parallel in Mark to 13:2b (Mark 4:2).

simply to conclude that Matthew provides no sufficient basis for distinguishing between the singular and the plural forms of ὄχλος.

D *The Distinctiveness of Matthew's ὄχλος*

The most distinctive element in Matthew's portrayal of the crowds is the term he uses—ὄχλος. Unlike both Mark and Luke, it is virtually the only word that Matthew, as narrator, uses to characterize the crowds during Jesus' public ministry.[33] Mark and Luke, for instance, both use πλῆθος to describe the crowds,[34] and as noted above, Mark also uses πολλοί of the crowds, while Luke frequently uses λαός of them as well.[35] According to Minear, Luke changes Mark's ὄχλος to λαός some ten times,[36] and only uses Mark's ὄχλος nine times.[37] What is more, Luke uses ὄχλος to refer to groups other than the crowds. At Luke 6:17, for example, he mentions an ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Here he is describing a great "crowd" of Jesus' disciples, and not the multitude at all.[38] Given such diversity on the part of the other two synoptic evangelists, Matthew's reliance on a single designation is remarkable. He rarely uses other words to describe the multitudes

---

[33] This presupposes the correctness of the argument advanced above for the reading ὄχλοι πολλοί at 12:15. Matthew's use of λαός will be considered below.

[34] Mark 3:7,8; Luke 6:17; 23:27. It is worth noting that Luke, unlike the other two Synoptic Gospels, sometimes uses ὄχλος or πλῆθος with a qualifying genitive. A good example of this is Luke 6:17: καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ κτλ. (cf. Luke 23:27). Luke also uses πλῆθος with a qualifying genitive in reference to disciples (Luke 19:37), elders of the people (Luke 23:1), and even of fish (Luke 5:6). See further, J. Zmijewski, "πλῆθος" *EDNT* III 103-05; G. Delling, "πλῆθος κτλ" *TDNT* VI 274-283; and Zingg, *Wachsen*, 65-67.

[35] Mark 6:33 cf. Mark 6:34 and possibly Mark 11:8 (in conjunction with ἄλλοι). Minear ("Audience," 81) also takes Mark 2:15b as a reference to the crowd, as well as the πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί of Mark 2:15a. In my view, he stretches the crowd a bit too far. See, in preference, C. H. Turner ("Notes," 239), who argues that Mark 2:15b refers to the disciples.

[36] Luke 7:29; 8:47; 9:13; 19:48; 20:6; 20:19; 20:45; 23:13; 23:14.

[37] Minear, "Luke," 86. Minear also detects some differences in nuance between ὄχλος and λαός (84, 87). Conzelmann (*Mitte*, 153#1), however, notes at least three instances in Luke where [πᾶς ὁ] λαος is used interchangeably with ὄχλοι or ὄχλος (Luke 9:12): Luke 7:29/7:24; Luke 8:47/8:42; Luke 9:13/9:12. For further discussion of Luke's use of λαός, see Jerome Kodell, "Luke's Use of *Laos* 'People' especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19:28-24:53)," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 327-343.

[38] While Luke does not confine his use of ὄχλος to the crowds, he does not use it with the genitive construction when he refers to them, and in this respect his usage conforms to that of Matthew and Mark. On ὄχλος in Luke, see Minear, "Luke," 81-109 and Zingg, *Wachsen*, 61-63.

during Jesus' ministry,[39] and appears, with one exception, not to use ὄχλος of any other group.

The one occasion where Matthew does appear to use ὄχλος of another distinct group is the pericope of the ruler's daughter (9:18-26). At 9:23 mention is made of "the flute players and the crowd making a tumult" (τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον 9:23). Several factors suggest that a more proscribed group than the crowds is in view here. First, the crowds elsewhere normally follow Jesus. Here, however, the group is already there. Second, this ὄχλος is conjoined with flute players, a feature that appears to demarcate them as a special funerary group.[40] Finally, in his pericope Matthew has excised three of Mark's references to the crowd following Jesus (Mark 5:24, 27, 31) so that in his account only Jesus and his disciples follow the ruler (9:19).[41] Taken together, these features suggest that Matthew is distinguishing between the two "crowds."[42]

The above observations indicate that Matthew presents a more definite and delimited conception of the crowds than is found in the other two Synoptic Gospels. The fact that Mark uses different expressions to characterize the crowd is indicative of their relatively amorphous character in his gospel,[43] and Luke is similar to Mark in this respect. Further, Mark's use of πολλοί tends to emphasize the sheer numbers of people flocking to Jesus, as does Luke's use of πλῆθος with a genitive construction. While Matthew, too, undoubtedly stresses their numbers, he does so by modifying ὄχλος or ὄχλοι with a qualifying adjective. In other words, identifying the crowds appears to

---

[39] It has been suggested by J. Gnilka (*Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* [SANT 3; Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1961] 101#57) that λαός is also used to depict the crowds in Matthew. This question will be taken up in more detail in Chapter Four.

[40] William G. Thompson, "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 386#52; Gundry, *Matthew*, 175; Dennis C. Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," *NTS* 24 (1978) 400#6.

[41] Thompson, "Reflections," 386#52. Also noteworthy is Matthew's consistent designation of the group in the singular 9:23,25, no parallels.

[42] If this argument is valid, it would help to unify Matthew's conception further. Lohmeyer (*Matthäus*, 77#1) says of the crowd that "Die Zahl der ὄχλος kann so gross sein, dass Jesus sich vor ihnen in ein Boot rettet (13:3) oder so klein wie die Schar die Klagefrauen bei einem Todesfall." With this incident removed, the ὄχλοι appear as a more uniformly large group. The smallest group Matthew describes then is a houseful of the ὄχλοι (12:46, cf. 13:1), and after that the crowds in the temple (26:55; 22:33; 21:26). Otherwise, one gets the impression of large groups, especially in the feeding accounts. As shall emerge below, however, the size of the crowds is largely immaterial to Matthew (except insofar as they aggrandize the depiction of Jesus).

[43] To this, one can add Mark's frequent employment of impersonal constructions, many of which have the crowd as their implied subject.

be just as important as enumerating them. Of course, this feature can in part be attributed to his tendency to identify the actors in his gospel, but it is probably not his only rationale.

Matthew differs considerably from Mark not simply in the way he designates the group, but also in his portrayal. In general, these differences are consonant with the broader tendencies of the first gospel. One such tendency is Matthew's compression of the miracle stories. A characteristic example is Matthew's treatment of the ruler's daughter and the woman who touched Jesus' garment (9:18-26). Mark's account is far more extensive (Mark 5:21-43), and includes five mentions of the crowd. Matthew, by contrast, has only two. As Held has demonstrated, Matthew's paring down of the miracle stories to their essentials has been undertaken to develop the themes of Christology, faith, and discipleship.[44] When the crowds are tangential to these themes, they are not included in the narrative. Occasionally, Matthew appears almost Draconian in his editorial pruning of Mark, as there are some instances where the crowds have been eliminated even when they could conceivably have contributed to one of these themes. In the healing of the paralytic (9:1-8), as is well known, Matthew provides no rationale for the faith of the paralytic's bearers. It is left unexplained, where a single mention of the press caused by the crowd would have explained it.

Another tendency of Matthew's gospel that may account for omissions of Mark's crowd is Matthew's more exalted Christology. Senior has plausibly suggested that some of the references are excluded because of the negative light they cast on Jesus[45]—especially when "the crowds "crowd" Jesus."[46] Other references may also have been omitted because of their reference to the idea of the messianic secret.[47]

In essence, therefore, Matthew has retained the bare bones of Mark's narrative of the crowds. He follows Mark in the essentials, but excises, particularly in individual healing narratives, much that he apparently regards as adventitious. Nevertheless, in spite of his deliberate pruning of Mark, Matthew is still indebted to that gospel

---

[44] Heinz Joachim Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories" in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (NTL; 2nd Ed. London: SCM, 1970) 165-192.

[45] Donald Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975) 150#2.

[46] The phrase is Struthers Malbon's, "Disciples," 120. Senior (*Passion*, 150#2) cites Mark 2:4; 3:9; 3:20; 5:21; 5:24; 5:31; 9:25 in this regard. Joel Marcus (*Mark 1-8* [AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 2000] 261) discerns "an undertone of threat" in Mark's crowds.

[47] Senior (*Passion,* 150#2) cites Mark 7:17 and Mark 7:33.

for many of the features of his portrayal of the crowds. As was mentioned above, Matthew's reliance on Q for his portrayal of the crowds is minimal. The main lineaments of the crowds are derived from Mark, and individual episodes such as the feedings retain much of the flavour that they have in Mark. Clearly, too, the place of the crowds as the perennial backdrop to Jesus' ministry is indebted to Mark's portrayal of the crowd.[48]

At the same time, Matthew has instituted some fundamental innovations. The most significant is his omission of much of the concrete detail, which, in Mark, depicts the crowds *qua* crowds.[49] As was just noted, in Matthew virtually no reference is made to crowds forming (Mark 9:25) or gathering (Mark 2:2; 4:1; 5:21; 8:1; cf. Matt 13:2). Remarks about the crowds hindering or crowding Jesus have also been removed, as have details of their preventing access to Jesus (Mark 2:4), potentially crushing him (Mark 3:9), preventing him from eating (Mark 3:20), or milling about him (Mark 5:24, 27, 30, 31). Matthew has also omitted references to individuals in the crowd speaking (Mark 9:17),[50] and excised a number of what might be described as "circumstantial" remarks[51] made by the crowds in Mark (Mark 1:27; 9:26; 10:49).[52]

---

[48] According to E. J. Pryke (*Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel* [SNTSMS 33; Cambridge: University Press, 1978] 137, 149), many of the references to the crowd in Mark are a product of Mark's redaction.

[49] Willoughby C. Allen (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* [ICC; 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907] xviii) also notes that Matthew commonly omits "statements of the thronging of the multitudes and the inconvenience caused by it."

[50] Compare, however, Matt 12:47 which is textually suspect: εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι. As the crowds are mentioned at 12:46, the strong presumption is that it is a member of the crowds who addressed Jesus (cf. Mark 3:32). On the other hand, some authorities ˚((892) *pc* (bo)) read τις τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

[51] Certainly most of the crowd's utterances in Matthew and Mark are 'circumstantial' in that they arise out of individual incidents. Mark's differ from Matthew's in that they are sporadic, unrelated, or possibly unflattering to Jesus (Mark 9:26). In the remarks Matthew has retained, however, there is a certain continuity and probably development.

[52] Strictly speaking, none of these utterances in Mark is explicitly attributed to the ὄχλος except possibly Mark 3:32: Mark 1:27 ἅπαντες; Mark 2:12 πάντας (cf. Mark 2:4); Mark 3:32 ὄχλος; Mark 7:37 ἐξεπλήσσοντο (cf. Mark 7:33); Mark 9:26 τοὺς πολλούς (cf. Mark 9:25); Mark 10:49 πολλοί (Mark 10:48 cf. Mark 10:46); Mark 11:9-10 οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες; Mark 15:13 οἱ δέ; Mark 15:14 οἱ δέ (cf. Mark 15:11 τὸν ὄχλον). Compare Matthew: 9:33 οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες; 12:23 πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον; 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες; 21:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον. This phenomenon is less evident in the Passion Account—27:21 οἱ δε εἶπαν (cf. 27:20 τοὺς ὄχλους); 27:22 λέγουσιν πάντες; 27:23 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες.

Further, as was just noted with Schenk's supposition of a "Capernaumite audience,"[53] Matthew very largely dissociates the crowds from specific geographic locales. While Mark's geographical references tend to be vague and are often the result of his editing,[54] they are still more definite that those provided by Matthew.[55] The result is very much a homogenized portrayal, one largely devoid of specifics and distinctive individual details. Yet, it results in a portrayal all the more remarkable simply because Matthew has removed many of those qualities that are characteristic of a crowd. In Matthew, the most distinctive feature of the crowds is how unlike crowds they actually are.

E *The Crowds as a Literary Construct*

In place of Mark's crowd-like traits, Matthew endues the crowds with a new set of characteristic actions and utterances, and repeats them with sufficient frequency that they become "formalized" or, perhaps better, "stylized" over the course of the gospel.[56] As with the description of the disciples or Jewish leaders, certain conventions or characteristic traits help to define the crowds. They follow Jesus (4:25; 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:19), they marvel (9:33; 15:31), they are astonished (7:28; 22:33), they are beside themselves (12:23); they are afraid (9:8); they glorify God (9:8; 15:31); consider John the Baptist a prophet (14:5; 21:26) and Jesus to be a prophet (21:11; 21:46) or the Son of David (12:23 (with μήτι); 21:9). In addition, they are feared by the leaders of Israel (14:5; 21:26; 21:46).[57]

---

[53] Schenk, *Sprache*, 350.

[54] See Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 339-40.

[55] For representative examples, cf. Mark 1:27, where "all" in the synagogue in Capernaum are amazed (no // in Matthew); Matthew replaces Mark's "Capernaum" (Mark 2:1) with "his own city" (9:1) in the healing of the paralytic pericope (9:1-8). At Mark 3:19 Jesus "went home," whereupon he was besieged by the crowd (Mark 3:20 no // in Matthew). Jesus is described as being in the Decapolis at Mark 5:20, where "all" marvel (no // in Matthew). Jesus returns to "the other side" of the Sea of Galilee and is immediately greeted by a "great crowd" (Mark 5:21 no // in Matthew). When he goes through the region of the Decapolis, he takes the deaf-mute apart from the crowds to heal him (Mark 7:31-33 no // in Matthew). Jesus' summons of the multitude at Mark 8:34 evidently transpires in Caesarea Philippi (Mark 8:27 no // in Matthew). Where locales are specified in Matthew (e.g., 19:1-2; 20:29), it is to illustrate Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

[56] C.H. Turner ("Notes," 227) describes Matthew's crowds as "stereoyped" as well as "vague." By "stylise," I mean the process whereby Matthew represents the groups in his gospel according to conventions, which he himself provides.

[57] The provenance and implications of these particular verses will be considered in more detail in later chapters.

These traits prompt several observations. The first is that almost every one of the crowds' attributions is repeated over the course of the gospel.[58] While some of the above features are also attributed to Mark's crowd, Matthew makes these traits characteristic of his own crowds by means of repetition. The effect of this "conventionalizing" is to give the crowds an overall consistency. Except in the Passion Narrative,[59] the crowds usually act in a consistent and predictable fashion. They follow Jesus at 4:25 and still follow him at 20:29. The crowds are amazed at his teaching at 7:28 and yet again at 22:33. The same can be said of the other features. Taken together they offer a more consistent and unified portrayal of the crowds.[60]

The second observation is that just made above, namely that the crowds function less as a "crowd" in the gospel. Apart from their description as "great crowds," they do very little that marks them out as a vast body of people. Almost every one of their actions and sayings could be attributed to a single individual without any appreciable disruption of the gospel's narrative. The crowds have moved from being a series of variegated, volatile and slightly unpredictable throngs to a largely uniform group focussed on Jesus.[61]

This uniformity in the crowds' actions and utterances results in a marked choric quality, and, certainly, in their words and deeds the crowds have more than one or two affinities with the chorus in Greek tragedy.[62] One manifest point of comparison is the two groups' corporate character. Both largely speak, act, and react as a whole, and although they are comprised of many individuals, they display a single recognizable *persona*. They act as if they were single characters. A second point of comparison is that their roles are essentially passive, since the two groups do not so much act as react, nor reason

---

[58] The exceptions are φοβέομαι at 9:8 and ἐξίστημι at 12:23. Yet even these terms relate closely to θαυμάζω and ἐκπλήσσομαι. On Matthew's penchant for repetition, see Ernst von Dobschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 20-26, who sees in this phenomenon proof of Matthew's rabbinic and catechetical tendencies.

[59] Minear ("Crowds," 35) has argued for a different crowd in the Passion Account. The issue will be taken up more fully below below.

[60] Matthew's characterization of the crowds will be considered in detail over the course of the book. Particular attention will be paid to the actions and utterances of the crowds, as these are especially determinative of Matthew's portrayal. Equally germane for our purposes, of course, are Jesus' attitudes towards and expectations of the crowds. For other elements affecting characterization, see Edwards, *Portrait*, 12-13.

[61] The Passion Narrative does show them acting more as a volatile and unpredictable throng (cf. 26:5; 27:24), but even here, as will become evident below, there is a marked theological agenda.

[62] Keener, *Matthew*, 671.

so much as emote. Typically, the Greek chorus does not engage in reasoned discourse, *rheseis*, but in emotional responses. As Vernant has observed, the Greek chorus' "role is to express…fears, hopes and judgements."[63] In so doing, the chorus amplifies the significance of the protagonist's action and interprets it for the audience. In acting as a foil, however, they remain largely static. Their very stability is designed to emphasize the tragic downward movement of the protagonist.[64] Much the same, *mutatis mutandis*, can be said for the role of the crowds in the gospel. They have been fashioned into a largely static foil designed to focus attention upon Jesus.

In this respect, except for Matthew's provision of the crowds with a distinctive and unified *persona*, the crowds' function does not differ appreciably from the crowd's function in Mark, which is also to make Jesus the cynosure. Where the two differ profoundly, however, is in the type of utterances that Matthew attributes to his choral crowds. First, there is a marked globalizing of the crowds' utterances so that they tend to provide distinctive lapidary conclusions to Jesus' words or deeds as a whole. Both Jesus' Sermon on the Mount and the catena of miracles in chapters 8 and 9, for instance, close with an astonished outburst by the crowds.[65]

Further, where the utterances of Mark's crowd are occasional and random, if admiring, Matthew's are of a fundamentally different order. Matthew has his crowds make explicit comments on Jesus' identity. The fact that christological titles—Son of David, prophet—are placed in their mouths demonstrates a profound change in their conception and status over their counterparts in Mark. Obviously, in attributing these titles to the crowds, Matthew indicates that what the crowds say about Jesus matters, and has to be factored into his portrait of Jesus. As a consequence, there is an inevitable theologizing of the crowds.[66] In defining Jesus theologically, the crowds necessarily

---

[63] J.-P. Vernant, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York: Zone Books, 1988) 23.

[64] This is not to suggest that Matthew's portrayal of the crowds is in any way indebted to Greek tragedy, as there are very considerable differences between Matthew's crowds and the Greek chorus. In all the tragedies, especially those of Aeschylus, the chorus was a major "actor" and was endued with lines far in excess of those of the crowds. E. A. Phoutrides ("The Chorus of Euripides," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 27 (1916) 79-81) estimates that the average choral component in Aeschylus is about 43%, in Sophocles, 20% and in Euripides, 21%.

[65] This particular characteristic of the crowds will be dealt with in more detail below in Chapter Six.

[66] For a contrary view, see Alexander Sand, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium* (Erträge der Forschung 275; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991) 79, who does not explain why it is that Matthew's crowds are made to comment on Jesus' identity.

define themselves theologically as well. The gospel's reader has to evaluate the crowds' pronouncements, and determine whether they are accurate or not. That is to say, in identifying Jesus, the crowds raise for the reader the question of their own identity.

Such a depiction of the crowds, therefore, displays a telling departure from Mark's portrayal of the crowd, which never has them pronounce explicitly on Jesus' identity. The closest Mark's crowd comes is at the Triumphal Entry: "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord" (Mark 11:9). Matthew, however, in his version (21:9) has the crowds use the same title he has himself used at 1:1—Son of David. At junctures like this, the crowds move from the background of the gospel to its foreground. They are no longer simply figures like cinema extras, rather, like the Greek chorus, they have become a character in their own right.[67]

In fact, this distinctive re-fashioning of the crowds is largely in keeping with Matthew's characterization of the two other groups in the gospel, the Jewish leaders, and the disciples. These two groups also bear the marks of Matthew's editorial hand, and like the crowds, could also be described as "collective entities."[68] With the Jewish leaders, for example, his stylization can be seen in their very simplification.[69] The Jewish leaders are largely characterized as a single flat character, a malign and monolithic whole opposed to Jesus. As Wilson aptly remarks, "Matthew tends to fuse the leaders into a single 'character,' which presents a united opposition to Jesus and his fol-

[67] Gibbs ("Purpose," 451) has noticed that "Matthew's heightened role for the ὄχλοι is unique among the Gospels."

[68] Cf. Terence L. Donaldson, "Guiding Readers—Making Disciples: Discipleship in Matthew's Narrative Strategy" in Richard N. Longenecker (ed.), *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 32.

[69] This simplification has already been presupposed in this study in my description of them as "Jewish leaders." In making this assumption I follow Van Tilborg (among others), who concludes that "Mt did not wish to create any distinction between the various groups" (*Leaders*, 6). Van Tilborg observes that for Matthew the Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, high priests and elders "are all equally representations of the one Israel" (*Leaders*, 1). Rolf Walker (*Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967] 16) also emphasizes the lack of distinctions Matthew makes. Matthew's unlikely pairing of the "Pharisees and Sadducees," for instance, indicates that the expression "ist ein literarischer Begriff mit rein literarischer Funktion, der innerhalb des Evangeliums die Einheit des 'geschichtlichen' Israel darzustellen hat." Cf. further, H. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi* (Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974) 92#42; R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäus-Evangelium* (2. Auf.; BevTh 33; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966) 20. While the distinctions between these various groups are minimized, the Pharisees do attain a certain prominence in the gospel as the particular adversaries of Jesus.

lowers."[70] They are represented thus from their first appearance and do not fundamentally change.[71] Their stylization is developed by Matthew's recurring use of various derogatory epithets to categorize the Jewish leaders or, more often, the Pharisees as the representatives of the Jewish leaders. In the first gospel, ὑποκριταί (15:7 // Mark 7:6; 22:18; 23:13, (14); 15, 23, 25, 27, 29), τυφλοί (23:17, 19, 26) or ὁδηγοί τυφλοί (15:14; ~ 23:16, 23:24), πονηροί (12:34 cf. 9:4; 22:18 cf. 12:39, 45; 16:4) have all, with the exception of 15:7, been introduced by Matthew.[72] These epithets, when conjoined with other characteristic traits and actions on the part of the leaders, present a distinctive and highly stylized portrait of the Jewish leaders.[73]

This stylization is very much evident in his representation of the disciples as well.[74] Not only are they in some measure idealized,[75] they are, like the Jewish leaders, endued by Matthew with various characteristic qualities. Two of the most distinctive of such traits are "little faith" and understanding,[76] although, as Zumstein has determined, many of their other actions are also formalized.[77] The crowds differ from both of the aforementioned groups in that virtually all of

---

[70] Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 50.

[71] See the extensive discussion provided by Janice Capel Anderson, *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again* [JSNTSup 91; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994] 97-126.

[72] For a more exhaustive examination of these words, see Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 27-72.

[73] Capel Anderson (*Narrative Web*, 113-119) shows how, in addition to epithets, repeated words and actions are also used to characterize the Jewish leaders as unrelentingly malign.

[74] See especially Edwards, *Portrait*, and Carter, *Matthew*, 242-56.

[75] On the idealization of the disciples, see the seminal study by Wilhelm Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (3. Auf.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) 157-160, as well as Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 152-55; Strecker, *Weg*, 193-4; and, for a corrective to Strecker, Luz, "Disciples," 101-102.

[76] On ὀλιγοπιστία, cf. Matt 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20 and the Q passage, Matt 6:30 // Luke 12:28. See too Matthew's use of διστάζω 14:31; 28:17, the only occurrences of the word in the NT. For a detailed examination, see Gerhard Barth, "Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen Evangelien," *ZTK* 72 (1975) 282-290; *idem*, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law" in *Tradition*, 118-121; *idem*, "ὀλιγοπιστία" *EDNT* II 506.

On understanding, see Barth, *Tradition*, 105-112; Edwards, *Portrait*, 40-53; Georg Künzel, *Studien zum Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (Calwer Theologische Monographien; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1978) 140-143; H. Balz, "συνίημι" *EDNT* III 307-8; H. Conzelmann, "συνίημι κτλ" *TDNT* VII 891-893; Strecker, *Weg*, 228-230.

[77] Zumstein (*La Condition du Croyant dans L'Evangile selon Matthieu* [OBO 16; Fribourg: Ed. Universitaires, 1977] 45) concludes his discussion of the disciples with the remark, "La tendance [est] de la description et la stylisation plutôt que l'historicisation."

their actions and sayings are stereotyped—something that can hardly be said of the disciples especially, nor, to a lesser degree, of the Jewish leaders.

Matthew's characterization of the crowds, then, falls somewhere midway between that of the leaders and that of the disciples. He defines the leaders largely by epithet and distinctive actions, though the latter are occasionally expanded into larger controversies and legal disputes. On the other hand, the characterization of the disciples as ὀλιγόπιστοι, or as those endowed with understanding is generally expressed in the gospel through a complex of events.[78] The notion of "little faith," for example, emerges out of entire episodes,[79] while, as Luz has shown, the theme of understanding is developed through Jesus' teaching of the disciples.[80] That is to say, Matthew shows not only that the disciples understand, but also how Jesus has brought them to understanding (cf. 16:5-12, 17:9-13).[81]

By comparison, the actions attributed to the crowds are far simpler. Their patterns of behaviour are more like the epithets that describe the leaders—tags designed to characterize the group under discussion. In this respect, the position of the crowds reflects their overall situation in the gospel, poised somewhere between the disciples and the Jewish leaders, although they are less fully developed than either of these two groups.

This lack of development has led Kingsbury to define the crowds from a literary point of view as a 'flat' character.[82] Of course, if one assumes that the crowds' betrayal of Jesus is dictated by tradition, and that they do not change otherwise, then it is a logical assumption to make. On the other hand, Black has placed more emphasis on the fact that the crowds do change, and has, therefore, styled the crowds as a 'round' character.[83] He rightly notes that in literary works it is usually only major characters who change, while minor characters remain constant.[84]

---

78 Edwards (*Portrait*, 14-16) would describe these as "character-shaping incidents."

79 The best examples are the Storm-Stilling and Walking on the Water pericopae. On the former, see Bornkamm's acclaimed essay "The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew," *Tradition*, 52-57 and Edwards, *Portrait*, 28-39; on the latter pericope, cf. G. Barth, "Glaube," 287-290.

80 Luz, "Disciples," 102-103.

81 Obviously, the paradigmatic nature of the disciples' behaviour is at issue here. Their behaviour furnishes *exempla* to the Christian community.

82 Kingsbury, *Story*, 23-24.

83 Black, "Depth," 619.

Are the crowds 'round' or 'flat'? While the crowds do remain largely static, there are, nevertheless, grounds for supposing that the crowds do change. For one thing, a comparison of their statements about Jesus (12:23 with 21:9) appears to demonstrate an increased insight into his divine nature. Further, the fact that the crowds' repudiation of Jesus is strongly emphasized by the evangelist provides grounds for assuming that the change in the crowds' character is not merely dictated by tradition or by Mark's gospel. The crowds' rejection of Jesus is an essential feature of their portrayal.[85] These changes indicate that the crowds have some of the 'roundness' associated with major characters, a roundness that is not found, for instance, in the depiction of the Jewish leaders. Hence, it is more appropriate to suppose that the crowds are portrayed as 'round,' if somewhat limited, characters.[86]

Given then that the crowds are largely a literary construct of Matthew's, it is probably fruitless to attempt to ascertain the makeup of the crowds. Matthew is simply not providing information about the historical crowds who must have followed the historical Jesus.[87] Duling, when he attempts the exercise, is forced to create them *ex nihilo*: "Perhaps they also contained bandits, eunuchs, slaves, tenant farmers, and other artisans and fishermen."[88] It is possible that they did, but Matthew's gospel does not provide any evidence to corroborate Duling's assumption.[89] Matthew's emphasis is not historical or mimetic.

The implications of this observation are considerable. It means that sociological analyses such as Saldarini's discussion of the crowds

---

[84] Black bases his judgements of literary character on Mary Doyle Springer, *A Rhetoric of Literary Character* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978) 11-44. She, in turn, has derived these categories from E. M. Forster's classic, *The Aspects of the Novel* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, (1927) 1964) 75-85.

[85] These claims will be corroborated more fully in the chapters below.

[86] At the same time, this does not necessarily (as Black argues, "Depth," 619") make the crowds more "lifelike."

[87] A facile example may help to make this point evident. Matthew is providing a painting of the crowds, not a photograph. David's painting of the coronation of Napoleon may have limited resemblance to the actual ceremony, yet the features it portrays are those that David (and Napoleon himself) considered essential. In the same fashion, Matthew "paints" or constructs the crowds in a way that will best contribute to his composition and overall agenda.

[88] Dennis C. Duling, "Matthew and Marginality," *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers* (Georgia: Scholars Press. 1993) 654; Vledder (*Conflict*, 130) adopts a similar approach.

[89] Perhaps the sole concrete detail Matthew does provide is the parenthetical remark "besides women and children" at in the feeding of the five thousand (14:21), which is likely an echo of Exodus 12:37.

need to recognize that Matthew's crowds are largely literary constructs.[90] The crowds are not, like Josephus' πλῆθος, primarily mimetic, but instead, literary and theological.[91] There is no doubt that Matthew's literary depiction of the crowds inevitably reflects some of the verities of the first century lower classes; their need, and yearning for leadership not least among them. Yet, to focus on these features without recognizing the influence of Matthew's theological concerns is to misinterpret them fundamentally.[92] Matthew's crowds are (to paraphrase Paul) a "new creation." It now remains to examine precisely how Matthew has (re)constructed his crowds. The next chapter will begin this process by examining their ethnic constitution.

F *Conclusion*

In comparison with Mark and Luke, Matthew has produced a more consistent and unified conception of the crowds. Eschewing other words, he commonly uses ὄχλοι (singular or plural indifferently) to refer to the crowds, and almost without exception to the crowds alone. These crowds are strikingly different from Mark's crowd. While the main lineaments are similar—groups who are associated with Jesus both in his public ministry and Passion—the distinctive features are as different as the two gospels are from each other. Matthew has appropriated the features he wanted from Mark's crowd and refashioned them considerably. The result is that where Mark's crowd is largely occasional, variegated, and intrusive, Matthew's is constant, uniform, and unobtrusive. Where Mark's crowd appears to function largely as an instant, if ephemeral, setting for Jesus' ministry, Matthew's functions as an ongoing foil to that ministry. The first evangelist has largely jettisoned those features in Mark's gospel that would mark them out as a crowd. Instead, he has endued his crowds with various characteristic traits and endowed them with a definite

---

[90] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 38-39.

[91] This is not to deny that Josephus' own crowd scenes conform to his particular literary agenda. For an example of the analysis of literary crowds, see David Lodge, "Crowds and Power in the Early Victorian Novel" in *idem*, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990) 100-15.

[92] In an intriguing article, Peter Haas ("The Am Ha'Arets as Literary Character" in J. Neusner et al., *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Intellect in Quest of Understanding*, Vol. 2 [BJS 173; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989] 139-53) makes a similar point about the am ha'arets: they are a "literary devise" (p. 153). Recognition of this fact necessarily shifts the focus "from speculations about the socio-economic make-up of Roman Palestine to understandings of how the authors of the early rabbinic documents conceived of and described their world" (p. 151).

choric function. He has turned them thereby into a distinctive character akin to the disciples and Jewish leaders, a character that is, in the main, a literary creation. While it is not inconceivable that Matthew has relied on historical and traditional details to inform this portrayal, it is, nevertheless, given his obvious reliance on Mark, highly unlikely. Matthew's crowds emerge, therefore, as a new literary and theological creation.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER THREE

A *The Ethnic Constitution of the Crowds*

The purpose of this chapter is to determine what Matthew sees as the ethnic makeup of his crowds. Are they Jewish, gentile, both, or does it vary depending on the particular point in Jesus' ministry? None of these options can be categorically ruled out. While it is evident from passages like 4:25 and 9:33 that at least some of the crowds are considered to be Jewish, other passages, such as 15:29-39, are seen to intimate the presence of gentile crowds in Jesus' ministry or at the least, a gentile stratum in the Jewish crowds.[1] The following examination will take into account the variety of the Matthean data, and begin by considering Matthew's geographical references—specifically the references to Syria, the Decapolis, and "Beyond the Jordan." From there, it will move to a consideration of other indices that the gospel furnishes about the crowds' make-up, including the feeding of the four thousand (15:29-39).

B *Matthew's Geographical References*

The chief locus for determining the crowds' ethnic constitution is 4:23-25:

> 4:23 Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and curing every disease and every sickness among the people. 4:24 So his fame spread throughout all Syria, and they brought to him all the sick, those who were afflicted with various diseases and pains, demoniacs, epileptics, and paralytics, and he cured them. 4:25 And great crowds followed him from Galilee, the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea, and from beyond the Jordan.

This editorial summary is a composite largely based on Mark 1:39 and 3:7b-8.[2] The latter passage relates that "a great multitude from Galilee followed; also from Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and from about Tyre and Sidon a great

---

[1] The evidence for the ethnic makeup of Mark's crowd is also difficult to assess, though many would regard the crowd of four thousand fed by Jesus (Mark 8:1-9) as Gentiles; cf. J. R. C. Cousland, "The Feeding of the four thousand *Gentiles* in Matthew?," *NovT* 61 (1999) 14 and Donaldson, *Mountain*, 261#42.

[2] Mark 1:39 reads: "And he went throughout all Galilee, preaching in their synagogues and casting out demons."

multitude." Matthew's account is considerably more limited. He eliminates Idumea as well as Tyre and Sidon.[3] In their stead he has added the Decapolis, possibly on the basis of Mark 5:20 or 7:31 (the word being otherwise unattested in the NT), and reports at 4:24 in an otherwise unparalleled passage that Jesus' "fame spread throughout all Syria."

The rationale underlying Matthew's selection of regions is not readily discerned. It is puzzling, for instance, that Tyre and Sidon should be eliminated, as Jesus later withdraws to the "district" of Tyre and Sidon (15:21). And, why should Matthew include Syria, when Syria is apparently absent from his sources? The following analysis will consider such questions, and also investigate several of the regions or cities mentioned by Matthew—specifically Syria, the Decapolis and "beyond the Jordan"—with a view to establishing how Matthew may have understood their ethnic constitution.[4] It will begin with Matthew's reference to Syria.[5]

C *Syria*

Syria is the only geographical region mentioned at 4:23-25 that is not explicitly derived from Mark. It may be, however, that Matthew is simply paraphrasing Mark 3:8—"from about Tyre and Sidon" (καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα), replacing Tyre and Sidon with Syria as a whole. If so, then all Matthew's geographical indices would ultimately derive from the second gospel. Yet, at least two factors speak against this supposition. First, Tyre and Sidon, even with their attendant territories, were but a small fraction of Syria. Second, it is often postulated that Syria has been included by the evangelist simply to indicate the gospel's provenance. The reference functions as a type of

---

[3] There were significant Jewish populations in all three areas. While Idumaea was populated by Jews (Josephus, *BJ* 2.43), it also contained other ethnic groups including Edomites and Nabateans (Strabo 16.2.34; 16.23.34). For Tyre, cf. Josephus, *BJ* 2.478.

[4] Matthew's emendations of some of the geographical cruces present in Mark could argue for a reasonable acquaintance with geography of Judea (cf. Cousland, "Feeding," 9). Cf. Martin Hengel, "The Geography of Palestine in Acts" in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting. Volume 4: Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 27-78, who discusses the question of geographical knowledge in ancient authors and Luke in particular.

[5] Much of the ensuing discussion depends on evidence from the writings of Josephus. For a generally favourable assessment of the reliability of Josephus' geographical information, see Zeev Safrai, "The Description of the Land of Israel in Josephus' Works" in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989) 295-324.

authorial signature, analogous to 13:52.[6] Both factors would suggest, therefore, that Matthew's inclusion of Syria is not derived from Mark.

This naturally raises the question of how Matthew conceives of Syria.[7] The issue is problematic because Syria was defined in at least two different ways in the first centuries of the Common Era—either as the Roman province of that name, or as a more proscribed region. In the Mishnah, the latter conception predominates, where Syria (סוּרִיא) typically denotes a limited area in immediate propinquity to Palestine, particularly those regions just to the south of Mount Hermon.[8] The region is variously described as extending eastward to Damascus and beyond, and north as far as Antioch,[9] or, alternately, as the Talmud has it, not quite so far north as Antioch.[10] The apostle Paul also appears to refer to Syria in a limited sense when, in Galatians 1:21, he mentions that he had gone to "the regions (τὰ κλίματα) of Syria and Cilicia."[11]

Given the similarity of Matthew 4:24a to Mark 1:28, Matthew may have understood Mark's "the surrounding region of Galilee" (τὴν

---

[6] This position finds its classical exponent in Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 500-507. Syria's resident urban Jewish population has made it a commonplace to regard Syria as the area where Matthew's gospel originated. J. Meier has made a strong case for Antioch in R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983) 18-27. More recently, the question has been explored in detail by contributors to Balch, *Social History of the Matthean Community*, and forcefully advocated by David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

[7] For the origin of the term "Syria" and the region's history prior to the NT, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135)*, rev. and ed., G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979-87) I 244-66 (hereafter *HJP*). For a recent and detailed account of the province see: Robyn Tracey, "Syria" in D. Gill and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Volume 2: *Graeco-Roman Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 223-78.

[8] See the following references in the Mishnah: Dem. 6:11; Shebi. 6:2,5,6; Maas. 5:5; Hall. 4:7,11; Orl. 3:9; B. K. 7:7; A. Zar. 1:8; Ohol. 18:7. Two passages in Josephus (*BJ* 3.35 and 7.43) are sometimes understood in this sense.

[9] DA I 417.

[10] bGitt. 44b; cf. Adolphe Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967) 9.

[11] H. D. Betz (*Galatians* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 79#220) has plausibly argued that these two "regions" are not to be understood as Roman provinces, but as territories. He finds confirmation for this point in Paul's mention of Judea at Galatians 1:22. Since the context indicates that Paul does not account Judea part of Syria (given its juxtaposition with Syria and Cilicia in Galatians 1:21), it follows that he does not regard Syria as a province but as a more proscribed area (p. 80#221). Betz does, however, take Matt 4:24 as a reference to the province.

περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας) as a reference to Syria in the limited sense.[12] The distribution of place names in 4.25 can also be taken as support for this position. Matthew mentions Galilee (Upper Galilee?) together with Syria to the north, and then repeats the mention of Galilee (Lower Galilee?) in conjunction with the regions further south.[13] It is possible, therefore, that Matthew understands Syria as the limited region north of Galilee.

On the other hand, Syria can also be taken to refer, as it does in Luke-Acts (Luke 2:2; Acts 15:23,41; 18:18), to the larger Roman province of Syria. Strabo, at about the turn of the Common Era, describes the province as "bounded on the north by Cilicia and Mt. Amanus…on the east by the Euphrates and by the Arabian Scenitae this side the Euphrates; and on the south by Arabia Felix and Egypt."[14] Strabo's account is rather vague, and this is understandable, since, in Tracey's words, the "'province of Syria' was a decidedly protean entity."[15] The province was primarily an administrative unit with highly fluid boundaries and highly diverse constituents.[16] This, too, could be the region referred to by Matthew. Its vast size would accentuate the magnitude of Jesus' fame.

It is difficult to decide between the region and province, though, given its Jewish frame of reference, the regional Syria is more likely. Either way, however, the local Jewish populace would have been in the minority, even though the Jewish population in the region of Syria was considerable. Josephus remarks that "The Jewish race…is particularly numerous in Syria, where intermingling is due to the proximity of the two countries" (*BJ* 7.43). Yet, Josephus gives no indication of the proportion of the Jewish population to the non-Jewish one. When one considers his further claim that the Jewish people were "densely interspersed among the native populations of every portion of the world" (*BJ* 7.43), his apologetic concerns become apparent. More reliable are the references to Syria in the Mishnah just cited. They typically attest to a significant local Jewish populace, struggling to maintain ritual purity in a dominant gentile milieu. Hence, it is probably safe to conclude that the Jews would not have

[12] DA I 417#9; BAGD, 653.
[13] Trilling, *Israel*, 135.
[14] Strabo 16.2.1.
[15] Tracey, "Syria," 235#26.
[16] J.-P. Rey-Coquais ("Syrie-Romaine, de Pompée à Dioclétien," *Journal of Roman Studies* 68 (1978) 48) remarks that Syria "était une mosaïque de cités, de principautés et de territoires aux statuts divers que Rome entreprit patiemment d'unifier et d'intégrer plus étroitement à l'empire."

been popularly regarded as the majority of the population in either the province or the region.

Does this mean that Matthew makes non-Jewish Syrians a substantial component of his crowds? The impersonal "they brought" (προσήνεγκαν), which immediately follows upon the mention of Syria, could be taken to refer to those people from Syria who brought their sick to Jesus. Some scholars have further argued for a causal relation between 4:24a and 4:24b, since Jesus' fame (ἀκοή) would presumably have induced the Syrians to bring their sick to him.[17]

On balance, however, this remains a questionable supposition. First of all, Matthew specifies that it is only Jesus' fame (ἀκοή) that extended to Syria, with no indication that Syrians returned to become followers of Jesus. It is striking that Syrians are not mentioned at all in 4:25. Matthew repeats the reference to Galilee from 4:23, but he says nothing whatever about Syria. Not even the "region" of Tyre and Sidon, which is later visited by Jesus, is mentioned. The strong inference is that it is only the report of Jesus that extended to all of Syria, an assumption that actually fits the sense of 4:24b better, since, if προσήνεγκαν were seen as referring to the Syrians, it would imply that Syrians were the only ones bringing their sick to Jesus.

The more probable sense of the passage is that Matthew begins by describing the nature of Jesus' ministry, and adds the reference to Syria as a parenthetical remark to indicate the magnitude of Jesus' fame. Verse 4:24b then goes on to discuss the general response to Jesus' healings, while 4:25 identifies the provenance of these followers of Jesus. Syria is not among them.

Once Syria is excluded from consideration, 4:25 only includes, but for one exception, regions which regarded as having predominantly Jewish populations.[18] That exception is the region of the Decapolis.

---

[17] Jonathan A. Draper, "The Genesis and Narrative Thrust of the Paraenesis in the Sermon on the Mount," *JSNT* 75 (1999) 29; Gundry, *Matthew*, 64; Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 35 (conjecturally); Stanton, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," 15; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 57.

[18] Jerusalem, Judea and Galilee were regarded as substantially Jewish: cf. *HJP* II 13. On Galilee in particular see: DA I 383-85; S. Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*: *323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980) 138-45; Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995) 50-51 (though he would distinguish Galileans from Judeans); Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 194-196; *HJP* II 184.

D *The Decapolis*

Matthew only mentions the Decapolis once, at 4:25, and has likely taken his reference from Mark (Mark 5:20; 7:31). As its name suggests, the region was a grouping of ten Greek cities, although the ancient sources are not unanimous about the constituent *poleis*. Pliny relates that "not all writers, keep to the same towns in the list; most, however, include Damascus...Philadelphia, Raphana ...Scythopolis ...Gadara ...Hippo ...Dion, Pella...Galasa, Canatha."[19] Josephus adheres to a different grouping since he implicitly excludes Damascus by accounting Scythopolis the largest of the cities in the Decapolis.[20]

The cities were largely Hellenized and were probably popularly regarded as such.[21] Although Alexander Jannaeus had conquered Dion, Scythopolis and Gadara, and attempted to impose Jewish customs upon them, they were re-established as Greek cities by Pompey and granted municipal autonomy (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.393-397; 14.74-76). Pella was destroyed for its refusal to accept Jewish customs. Hippo is also included in the list of those cities re-established by Pompey. While Hippo and Gadara were at one time possessions of Herod the Great, they regained their independent status upon his death and became attached to the province of Syria (*Ant.* 17.320). That the Jewish people regarded them as pagan is suggested by the fact that during the first Jewish revolt, the Jews, after the massacre in Caesarea, attacked Gerasa, Philadelphia, Pella, Scythopolis, Gadara and Hippo.[22] The references in Mark also appear to presuppose a gentile population; the presence of swine in the vicinity of the Decapolis (Mark 5:20) would suggest that Mark perceives it as pagan.[23]

---

[19] *Natural History* 5.74. Ptolemy's *Geographia* (5.15.22) includes Abida, Saana, Heliopolis, Ina, Samoulis, Capitolias, and Abila Lysiniae.

[20] Josephus, *BJ* 3.446, though see A. H. M. Jones' reservation about such an inference—*The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (2nd Ed., Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1983) 456-457.

[21] J. M. C. Bowsher in an interesting article ("Architecture and Religion in the Decapolis: A Numismatic Survey," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 199 (1987) 65-6) uses numismatic evidence to argue that, in religious terms, this Hellenization may have been superficial. He observes that many of the cults in the Decapolis appear to have been primarily semitic with a thin Greco-Roman overlay.

[22] Josephus, *BJ* 2.458; Fergus Millar, *The Roman Near East 31 BC - AD 337* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993) 408-414; Martin Hengel, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London: SCM, 1989) 14-15.

[23] Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 342.

Having said that, Josephus also supposes that some of the cities contained a substantial Jewish population. In his account of the reprisals that were exacted against their Jewish residents during the first Jewish revolt, Josephus claims that "upward of thirteen thousand" Jewish Scythopolitans were massacred by their fellow citizens (*BJ* 2.468; cf. *Vita* 26), while, in Damascus, 10,500 Jews were slaughtered.[24] Although Josephus does not give their numbers, Jewish residents at Hippo and Gadara were imprisoned or executed, "and so with the remaining cities of Syria" (*BJ* 2.478). Gerasa was exceptional in sparing its Jewish citizenry (*BJ* 2.480).

What proportion of the citizenry he supposed the Jews to represent is extremely hard to determine because, historically, it is difficult to gauge the actual size of individual cities in the Decapolis.[25] A very rough indication of the size of cities in Syria can be ascertained from cities north of the Decapolis such as Apamea and Antioch. With respect to Apamea, a famous inscription refers to the census undertaken there by Sulpicius Quirinus in 6-7 CE: *Iussu Quirini censum egi Apamenae civitatis millium hominum civium CXVII.*[26] Cumont, in his examination of the inscription, estimates that when the slaves, rural proletariat, and workingmen of the city are factored in, the total for the territory of Apamea included "at least four to five hundred thousand souls."[27] It is not evident, however, how Cumont's estimate relates to estimates for the population of the city of Antioch, even if Apamea was accounted one of the four largest cities in Syria (Strabo 16.2.4). Estimates of the total population of Antioch emerge with figures that are substantially less than those for Apamea,[28] which is surprising given Antioch's later reputation as the fourth largest city in the empire.[29] Strabo (16.2.5) attests that it "does not fall much short,

---

[24] Josephus, *BJ* 2.561. At *BJ* 7.368, he mentions 18,000 "with their wives and families."

[25] Hans Bietenhard ("Die syrische Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Trajan," *ANRW* II 8 248) deems such an enterprise "unmöglich." On the population of Palestine as a whole, see Magen Broshi, "The Population of Western Palestine in the Roman-Byzantine Period," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 236 (1980) 1-10. The following discussion accepts Josephus' figures at face value, though they may well be exaggerations.

[26] For the inscription and commentary, see Franz Cumont, "The Population of Syria," *Journal of Roman Studies* 24 (1934) 187-190.

[27] Cumont, "Syria,"189.

[28] Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961) 582-3. Further figures are provided by Carter (*Matthew*, 89#7).

[29] Ausonius, *Ord. Urb. Nob.* 2.22.

either in power or in size, of Seleucia on the Tigris or Alexandria in Egypt." Diodorus Siculus (17.52.6) claims that, *ca.* 50 BCE, Alexandria had 300,000 free inhabitants;[30] while Pliny estimates that Seleucia had 600,000 residents (*HN* 6.122).

By contrast, recent estimates of the population of Jerusalem suggest something in the neighbourhood of a hundred thousand.[31] While Reinhardt, too, acknowledges the impossibility of furnishing an exact calculation, he settles on 60,000 as a lower limit, although he is inclined to think that in the forties of the first century of the Common Era it was more probably 100-120,000 inhabitants.[32] Given this range of figures, Josephus' estimates of 10 or 13 thousand Jewish inhabitants in Damascus or Scythopolis would represent no small proportion of the population, especially if the city had 100 thousand residents. Given the assumption that the chief cities of the Decapolis were probably far closer in size to Jerusalem than to Apamea or Antioch, the Jews would have represented a substantial minority presence, but a minority nonetheless. This historical assessment appears to comport with the tenor of Josephus' narrative, which seems to presuppose that the Jewish populace was outnumbered by a larger pagan presence.

If Mark and Josephus provide something of a representative viewpoint, Matthew's inclusion of Decapolitan followers of Jesus certainly leaves open the possibility that he includes Gentiles among the crowds. Naturally one could argue with Albrecht Alt that "In Matthew 4:25 the thought is primarily of the Jewish inhabitants of the Decapolis,"[33] but this rather smacks of special pleading. The reference to the Decapolis, therefore, could indicate that Matthew

[30] Thus Alan K. Bowman (*Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332BC-AD642* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986] 208) extrapolates from Diodorus' figure to "an overall total of around half-a-million."

[31] This estimate represents a substantial modification of Joachim Jeremias' (still influential) figure of 25-30,000 (*Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969] 84). Compare the more recent overview by Wolfgang Reinhardt, "The Population Size of Jerusalem and the Numerical Growth of the Jerusalem Church" in Bauckham, *Book of Acts*, 237-65, particularly his summary of recent estimates (pp. 241-43).

[32] Reinhardt, "Population," 263. Hengel (*Hellenization*, 10) suggests somewhere between 80,000 and 100,000 inhabitants. Compare these figures with M. Avi-Yonah's ("Historical Geography of Palestine" in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* [Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; Fortress: Philadelphia, 1974] Vol. I 109) figures for Jewish population in the First Century CE. He estimates there were about two and a half million Jews in Palestine, a million in Egypt, and four million in the Diaspora.

[33] Albrecht Alt, *Where Jesus Worked* (London: Epworth, 1961) 27#73.

portrays the crowds as partly gentile. What then of the crowds from "beyond the Jordan?"

E *Beyond the Jordan*

In Matthew and Mark, the phrase "beyond the Jordan" (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) functions as an indeclinable proper name (4:25 cf. 4:15 (Isa 8:23); Mark 3:8 cf. Mark 10:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.198; 12.222),[34] the Greek being based on established Hebrew usage.[35] Usually it is taken to refer to the region of Perea, which bordered on the Decapolis and was situated across from Judea and Samaria on the eastern side of the Jordan River.[36] Josephus sets its parameters as follows: "Peraea extends in length from Machaerus to Pella, in breadth from Philadelphia to the Jordan. The northern frontier is Pella…the western frontier is the Jordan; on the south it is bounded by the land of Moab, on the east by Arabia, Heshbonitis, Philadelphia, and Gerasa" (*BJ* 3.46,7).

If "beyond the Jordan" refers to Perea, the region was popularly considered to be Jewish in the First Century CE. Josephus' delineation of the region's boundaries presupposes it to be a Jewish region,[37] as does his account of the revolt, where the Pereans and Perea were subdued by the Romans (*BJ* 4.413-439). The Mishnah also considers it to be Jewish territory, which, together with Judea and Galilee, comprised the main Jewish enclaves in Palestine.[38]

Recently, however, Klaus-Stefan Krieger has argued that Matthew understands the region differently.[39] Krieger contends that, at 4:25, Perea cannot be regarded as "the other side of the Jordan," since Perea was a part of the province of Judea, which is mentioned in this same verse. He allows that at 19:1 Matthew does mean Perea, but only because he describes it as "*the region of Judea* beyond the Jordan" (τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου 19:1). At 4:25 and 4:15, however, Matthew understands "beyond the Jordan" differently since he does not specify that it was a part of the region of Judea.

[34] Cf. John 1:28; 3:26; 10:40, which may have this sense.
[35] F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979) s.v. בֹּר (hereafter BDB).
[36] A variant reading of Luke 6:17 contains the only occurrence of the name Perea in the NT: και [της W] Περαιας° *W ff[2].
[37] Josephus, *BJ* 3.47 with the remarks in *HJP* II 6.
[38] Shab. 9:2; Bikk. 1:10; Taan. 3:6(?); Ket. 13:10; B.B. 3:2; Makk. 2:4; Eduy. 8:7; Men. 8:3.
[39] Klaus-Stefan Krieger, "Publikum," 98-119.

Here, according to Krieger, it is the territory of Agrippa II that Matthew has in view, notably Gaulanitis, Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Ulatha and Ituria. That the fulfilment citation at 4:15 appears to regard the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali as land "beyond the Jordan" also indicates that the expression has a northern sphere of reference. Krieger takes these data as confirmation of his larger argument that the first gospel reflects the territorial realities of Palestine in the post-70 period.[40] He observes that it was only after 70 that the imperial province of Judea included Perea.[41]

Krieger's proposal, however, is problematic, particularly with respect to his understanding of "beyond the Jordan." While he assumes that territory to the east of the Jordan is meant, Matthew's perspective at 4:15 could well be one that looks to the west of the Jordan River, not to the east of it.[42] In the fulfilment citation, Zebulun and Naphtali are situated to the west of the Jordan, "toward the Sea," that is, toward the Mediterranean. This western point of view is very likely the perspective of Isaiah 8:23 in the MT,[43] even if it may not be that of the LXX.[44] The latter reads: καὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου, suggesting that a region to the east of the Jordan is meant. Matthew, however, appears to rely on the MT at least as much as he does the LXX for this particular citation,[45] and in the MT עבר הירדן not uncommonly refers to the region west of the Jordan.[46] The opacity of the citation makes it difficult to be certain one way or another, but it certainly raises doubts about Krieger's identification.

More serious doubts arise from his assumption that πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου means the same thing at 4:25 as it does at 4:15. More than

[40] Krieger, "Publikum," 104.
[41] Krieger, "Publikum," 105.
[42] As it does, for instance, in Judith 1:9: καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῆς καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου ἕως Ιερουσαλημ. Some have argued that Matthew 19:1 betrays a similar perspective; cf. Dixon Slingerland, "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Matthew's Gospel," *JSNT* 3 (1979) 18-28; cf. DA I 382 for further discussion.
[43] DA I 383; G. Stemberger, "Galilee—Land of Salvation?" in W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) 420.
[44] Sim, *Christian Judaism*, 42.
[45] Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XX. 2nd Ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968) 104-6.
[46] BDB s.v. lists 9 occurrences of the word signifying land west of the Jordan and 36 for land east of it. Yohanan Aharoni (*The Land of the Bible A Historical Geography* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967] 71) remarks on a similar phenomenon with the Euphrates, where the designation "beyond the river," meaning Syria-Palestine, actually occurs at 1 Kings 4:24. The official title of the Fifth Satrapy (Ezra 4:10; 5:3) was עבר-נהרה.

likely, it does not. The expression πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου is substantival at 4:25,[47] while at 4:15 it is adverbial. In Matthew's much-abbreviated citation (γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλίμ, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδά νου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν), the phrase πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου appears to stand in apposition to ὁδὸν θαλάσσης. The accusative ὁδὸν here, in analogy with the Hebrew דֶּרֶךְ, is used as a preposition meaning "toward," while πέραν is adverbial, meaning "across."[48] Taken together, the two phrases read "toward the sea, across the Jordan," which is precisely how the RSV translates it.[49] The phrase, therefore, is not speaking of a specific Transjordanian region, but merely situating Zebulun and Naphtali between the Jordan and the Mediterranean. As such, it appears to offer little justification for identifying Agrippa's holdings as the Transjordan, especially when the substantival use of the term at 19:1 explicitly identifies it with the region of Perea.[50] In sum, therefore, the traditional identification of πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου with Perea is the optimal way of understanding Matthew 4:25. If so, Matthew probably accounted those from "Beyond the Jordan" as Jewish.

When this interpretation is combined with the above findings, it emerges that Matthew likely considered all of the regions mentioned in 4:25 to be Jewish, with the possible exception of the Decapolis. How then are these data to be explained? If Matthew regarded his crowds as being composed of Jews, then why did he include the Decapolis? If he envisaged a mixed audience, why has he left Tyre, Sidon and Idumea—all of which had significant Jewish populations—out of account?[51] Is there a rationale that would help to account for Matthew's inclusion of the various regions he mentions in 4:25?

F *Matthew's Geographical Rationale*

Matthew's rather idiosyncratic selection of places has recently elicited two widely divergent explanations. Gerhard Lohfink has elaborated

---

[47] Slingerland, "Origin," 19,28#22.

[48] BAGD 1a; F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: University Press, 1968) 61 (hereafter BDF); J. H. Moulton, *Grammar* III 247.

[49] This reading is even more unequivocal in the NRSV, which reads: "on the road by the sea, across the Jordan." Cf. further, Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 249-50.

[50] Even if Perea was not a part of Judea until after 70 CE, it may have popularly been regarded as such, simply because of the number of Jews who were residing there.

[51] For Tyre, cf. Josephus, *BJ* 2.478 and *HJP* III 15. While Idumaea was populated by Jews (cf. Josephus, *BJ* 2.43; for their Judaizing by John Hyrcanus, cf. *Ant.* 13.257-8; 15.254), it also contained other ethnic groups such as Edomites and Nabateans (Strabo 16.2.34; 16.23.34).

upon an argument earlier proposed by Wolfgang Trilling[52] to the effect that the places mentioned in the gospel were calculated to represent the gathering of all Israel to Jesus.[53] For this reason, he suggests that Matthew has omitted Tyre, Sidon and Idumea and, as in the Mishnah, regarded Galilee, Judea and Perea as Jewish. Syria is to be understood in the regional sense, and is Matthew's interpretation of Mark's "surrounding region of Galilee." Moreover, Lohfink rejects the supposition that Matthew has included the Decapolis because of its Jewish minority, since Tyre also had a Jewish minority.[54] Instead, he explains its inclusion as an expression of the idealized boundaries of Israel, the Israel of the fathers. At various points in Israel's history (the Davidic kingdom, the kingdom of Alexander Janneus) the Decapolis had been part of Israel, and is therefore regarded as such here.[55] When the Decapolis is added to the other regions that Matthew includes, they comprise a symbolic Israel: the northwest (Galilee), the northeast (the Decapolis), the southwest (Jerusalem and Judea) and the southeast (Perea).[56]

Yet, Lohfink's view has not carried the day. In the article cited above, Klaus-Stefan Krieger discounts Lohfink's entire interpretation. He objects that the Decapolis and Perea are only a fraction of the region east of the Jordan that once comprised David's kingdom, and that Lohfink omits Moab and the south part of Ammon. He further contends that Lohfink defines the region of Syria in too limited a sense. Finally, he asks why one should postulate speculative boundaries for Israel when Matthew is so clearly reflecting the geographical realities of his own day.[57]

Krieger, as was noted earlier, explains the geography of the first gospel in light of the territorial realities of Palestine in the post-70 period.[58] He argues that, by Judea, Matthew means the Roman province of that name, established after 70, which consolidated Judea, Samaria, Perea and Idumea. This consolidation accounts for Matthew's failure to mention Idumea and Samaria, and explains why

---

[52] Trilling, *Israel*, 136.
[53] Lohfink, "Bergpredigt," 276; cf. Heinz Giesen, "Jesu Krankenheilungen im Verständnis des Matthäusevangeliums" in Ludger Schenke (ed.), *Studien des Matthäusevangeliums* (Stuttgart: KBW, 1988) 91.
[54] Lohfink, "Bergpredigt," 274-75.
[55] Lohfink, "Bergpredigt," 275-76.
[56] Lohfink, "Bergpredigt," 276. Cf. DA I 420; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 49; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 109; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 81; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206; Sim, *Christian Judaism*, 44.
[57] Krieger, "Publikum."
[58] Krieger, "Publikum," 104.

"beyond the Jordan"—which Krieger does allow to be Perea at 19:1—is identified as the "region of Judea."[59] Further, even if Galilee at this time was divided between the province of Judea and the territory of Agrippa II, Krieger maintains that it retains its distinct identity in the gospel because of its prominence as the scene of Jesus' activity, and because of the regional awareness of its inhabitants who continued to call it Galilee in spite of the division.[60]

Although Krieger's argument is suggestive, it is far from conclusive. The chief difficulty with it is that, despite its insistence on the gospel's correspondence to the political situation of the post-70 period, there is actually very little in Matthew to tie it to a period after the first revolt. None of the places named in Matthew requires a post-70 setting. As was just mentioned, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου does not, in all likelihood, refer to the territories of Agrippa II, but to Perea. And, as Krieger recognizes, the gospel's frequent mention of an undivided Galilee weakens his argument, since Galilee, though not, perhaps, without "some internal administrative separateness,"[61] was under direct Roman jurisdiction after the death of Agrippa I (44 CE), as part of an enlarged province of Judea.[62] Although Galilee's inclusion in the province is not expressly mentioned in the sources, it is, in Smallwood's words, "abundantly clear from the history of the years 44-66."[63] Moreover, after the Jewish revolt Galilee was, again, incorporated into the province of Judea.[64] Why Matthew should then keep Galilee distinct from Judea at 4:25 is puzzling, especially when he has already referred to Galilee once already at 4:23. Taken as a whole then, the geographical features of Matthew's gospel can hardly be said to conform to the period after the Jewish revolt. For this reason, Lohfink's suggestion remains the more satisfactory of the two.

Indeed, elsewhere Matthew appears to be less concerned with the political topography of Judea than with the idea of God's people and

[59] Krieger, "Publikum," 105. He notes that Matthew does not adopt the καὶ from Mark 10:1 (τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας [καὶ] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου), which puts the two into apposition. Mark's text, however, is textually uncertain.

[60] Krieger, "Das Publikum," 104.

[61] S. Freyne, "Galilee (Hellenistic/Roman)" in D. N Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992) II 896 (hereafter *ABD*).

[62] Tacitus, *Annals* 12.54; Josephus, *BJ* 2.247. On the discrepancy between the two sources—whether Ventidius Cumanus and Antonius Felix governed concurrently or successively—see *HJP* I 459#15.

[63] E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian* (SJLA 20; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 200#72.

[64] Freyne, "Galilee," 896.

an idealized Israel.[65] That geographical realities are subordinated to spiritual verities can be inferred, for example, from the pericope of the Canaanite woman. Matthew appropriates the narrative from Mark (Mark 7:24-30), but, in doing so, transmutes the "Syrophoenician woman" (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει Mark 7:26) into a "Canaanite woman" (γυνὴ Χαναναία Matt 15:21). The term "Syrophoenician" accords with the contemporary designation for the region,[66] and, as Theissen has demonstrated in his analysis of Mark's narrative, the term also reveals her social status. As a "Hellene," she belonged to the privileged upper class of Syrophoenician society.[67] Matthew, however, has eliminated all of Mark's social and political detail in favour of the archaic designation, Canaanitess.[68] In characterizing her as one of the traditional enemies of the people of Israel, Matthew is evidently invoking salvation-historical categories in place of socio-political realities. For Matthew, Israel's past is far more resonant than Judea's present.

Matthew's geography, therefore, does not simply take into account the Palestine of Jesus' own day; it refracts it through the lens of Israel's history as disclosed in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the same way that Matthew chooses to include a genealogy in his gospel that symbolically encompasses the time frame of all of Israel's history, so too does his geography include echoes of that history. For Matthew, the Israel of Jesus, the Son of David is to some extent contiguous with the Israel of David, his forebear. By the same token, the regions that produce crowds of followers for Jesus represent an idealized Israel similar in conception to "all the tribes of Israel," who flock to David at 2 Sam 5:1.

That Matthew should emerge with what might be described as an "idealized Israel" or "speculative boundaries" is, despite Krieger's cavils, entirely consonant with the pervasiveness of similar notions of Israel in the centuries surrounding the turn of the Common Era. Mendels has demonstrated the emergence, beginning in the second

---

[65] Ulrich Luz (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: Mt 18-25* (EKKNT 1/3; Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1997] 92#17) observes that Matthew "sich für geographische Fragen wenig interessierte."

[66] Lucian (*Deorum Concilium* 4) describes Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, as a Συροφοίνιξ; cf. Diodorus Siculus 19.93.7—ἡ Φοινίκη Συρία.

[67] Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 71-2.

[68] For other, less-satisfactory explanations of Matthew's substitution of "Canaanitess" for "Syrophoenician woman," see the overview in DA II 547.

[69] Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 15; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987) 121.

century BCE, of "many variants of the concept of 'greater' Eretz Israel, ranging from those adopting the borders achieved by David and Solomon, to the borders which were drawn by God in his division of the *oecumene* to its nations, including the Jews."[69]

Eupolemus' account of the Davidic conquest is an apt case in point. Eupolemos relates that David "subdued the Syrians dwelling by the river Euphrates and in the region of Commagene and the Assyrians in Galadene and the Phoenicians; he also fought against the Idumeans, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Itureans, the Nabataeans and the Nabdaeans; he further waged war against Souron, the king of Tyre and he compelled them to pay tribute to the Jews."[70] Eupolemus not only increases the extent of the Davidic kingdom in this account, he also uses contemporary geographical designations to delineate David's conquest.[71] Eupolemus' ideal Israel is refracted through a contemporary template, although he interprets the past in light of the present, while Matthew interprets the present in light of the past.

An idealized Israel can also be detected in the Mishnah, which views Israel from at least three different perspectives: 1) the country occupied by those who returned from Babylon, 2) the land obtained in the conquest, 3) the land that the Israelites had been unable to conquer.[72] The frontiers would vary according to the context of the discussion, but that such variations existed is most revealing. Nor, given Israel's chequered history is it unexpected, since it is precisely these historical vacillations that helped to give rise to the idealized views, at least, until the land began to be perceived primarily as an eschatological entity. Matthew, therefore, like Eupolemus before him and the Mishnah after him, is invoking an idealized conception of Eretz Israel.

This is not to deny that Matthew's selection of locales has, in large measure, been predicated on those territories occurring in Mark. While Matthew has remained faithful to his source, he has also made a few adjustments, and these can best be explained in light of his theology. The regions he mentions together comprise an idealized Israel, and conform in a rough and ready way to the boundaries of the Davidic kingdom, even if they are not sketched in with any great

---

70 *OTP* II 30:3-5 = Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.30.3-5.

71 B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Jewish Insititute of Religion, 1974) 131-39.

72 Cf. Neubauer, *Géographie*, 5-7. As the Tosefta indicates (Hallah 2:11), at least part of this estimation is based on Scripture. Hallah 2:11 explicitly cites Num 34:6. Cf. further, mHallah 4:8, mShabbat 6:1, and mMaaser Sheni 2:15.

exactitude. As in his genealogy, the information Matthew provides has been shaped by theological concerns. Just as he has grouped Jesus' forbears into three idealized groups of fourteen, so too has he blocked out the main lineaments of the Davidic kingdom. Krieger is quite right to point out the precise lack of geographical correspondence with David's conquests; just as he would be quite right in pointing out the omissions and temporal discrepancies in Matthew's genealogy.[73] To dwell on these discrepancies, however, is probably to misinterpret the evangelist. Matthew's approach is not historical, but theological.

If the foregoing argument holds, then it is likely that Matthew does not interpret the Decapolis as a gentile region. It is a part of Israel in an extended sense, and, as such, sends Jewish crowds to witness the coming of the Son of David. Naturally, the point cannot be pressed. It may be simply that Matthew wishes to prefigure the future influx of Gentiles to the kingdom.[74] Given, however, that the crowds are not described as originating from any other gentile territory, it is more likely that the evangelist accounts them Jewish.

G *Matthew 7:29*

Even if the reference to the Decapolis may allow for the presence of Gentiles amongst the crowds, other indices in the gospel indicate that Matthew presupposes that the multitudes are Jewish. The most decisive indication is 7:29, which, along with 7:28, provides the conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount. Here Jesus is described as having taught the crowds "as one who had authority, and not as their scribes" (ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν). The fact that the crowds are described as having scribes betrays their Jewish character.[75]

The passage has Mark 1:22 as its *Vorlage*, but Matthew has made considerable modifications to it. In Mark it describes the general reaction to Jesus' teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum. No specific instance of Jesus' teaching is provided by Mark; simply the auditors' response to it: "they were astonished at his teaching"

---

[73] For instance, W. D. Davies ("The Jewish Sources of Matthew's Messianism" in Charlesworth, *Messiah*, 504) notes that for the 500 years between Zerubbabel and Joseph, Matthew's genealogy provides only nine names.

[74] Stanton, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," 15.

[75] Donaldson, *Mountain*, 255#50. Cf. J. Andrew Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew* (The New Testament in Context; Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996) 70.

(ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ Mark 1:22). Matthew makes the crowds the subject of the verb, and adds "their" to Mark's "scribes." The result is that Matthew's text now refers to "their (i.e., the crowds') scribes" (οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν). That the crowds should be described as having scribes finds an analogue at 2:4, which mentions the "scribes of the people" (γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ). Even if this reference is not to Galilean scribes,[76] but to those in Jerusalem, both verses nonetheless refer to *Jewish* experts in scripture. Orton suggests that in each instance the "Pharisaic scribes" are in view.[77] Whether this is so or not, the possessive pronoun associates the crowds with Jewish legal experts.

This use of possessive pronouns with a possible ethnic connotation forms part of a larger pattern within the gospel. The pronoun αὐτῶν is repeated with frequency, chiefly in conjunction with synagogues (4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54 cf. 23:34), but also once with cities (11:1). "Their synagogue(s)" is also found in Mark (Mark 1:23; 1:39; cf. Luke 4:15),[78] but, as is so often the case, Matthew has expanded considerably on his source.

France has sought to discount the ethnic connotation by appealing to grammatical antecedents, even where the antecedents are not, strictly speaking, grammatical. He suggests that 4:23, 9:35; 12:9, and 13:54 refer to "the particular geographical area of the next phase of ministry," 10:17 and 23:34 refer to "those who oppose the Christian movement," and 7:29 refers to the crowds just mentioned.[79] While his analysis holds in some instances, it is very difficult to discern in a passage such as 12:9: "And he [sc. Jesus] went on from there, and entered their synagogue." When Matthew has not even ventured to specify a locale, it seems odd that he should then add that it was "their synagogue." To what "particular geographical area" is the evangelist referring? The pronouns at 4:23 and 13:54 are likewise without proper grammatical precedent.[80] Nor does France explain why the pronouns should occur with such regularity in the gospel. On

---

[76] On the presence of scribes in Galilee prior to 70 CE, cf. mShab. 16:7; 22:3 and *HJP* II 329.

[77] David Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 30-31. E. P. Sanders' (*Judaism: Practice and Belief 63BCE–66CE* [London: SCM, 1992] 172-182) argument for priestly scribes need not call Orton's findings into question.

[78] Here these pronouns are best regarded as a local or geographical specification; cf. L. Michael White, "Crisis Management and Boundary Maintenance: The Social Location of the Matthean Community" in Balch, *Social History*, 215-16.

[79] France, *Matthew*, 107.

[80] DA I 413.

balance, the lack of definite antecedents for the possessive pronouns and their frequency argue for a different interpretation.

The most common explanation is that the pronouns reflect a distancing of Matthew's Christian community from Judaism. The community has separated itself to such an extent that they are no longer participants in Jewish institutions, nor are they subject to "their scribes." The mention of "their scribes" may even imply the existence of "our," i.e. Christian, scribes (cf. 13:52; 23:34).[81] But, be that as it may, οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν certainly indicates that Matthew presupposes that the crowds are Jewish.[82]

H *Israel and the Crowds*

That the crowds are Jewish can also be adjudged from the frequency with which Matthew associates them with Israel.[83] As in the other Synoptic Gospels, "Israel" refers to the Jewish people.[84] The word's programmatic import in Matthew, however, is established with its first occurrence at 2:6. Here the scribes, citing Micah and 2 Samuel, inform Herod that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem, and would shepherd "my people Israel." The use of the possessive pronoun—*my* people—evokes the covenant established between God and his people, and, in particular, the promises made to David in 2 Samuel.[85] Most of the other references in the gospel, to a greater or lesser extent, conform to this understanding: Israel is the people of God.[86]

"Israel" is explicitly associated with the crowds in two instances: 9:33 and 15:31. At 9:33, the multitudes are described as being dumbfounded at Jesus' wonderworking, and are moved to exclaim, "Never was anything like this seen in Israel" (9:33). The occurrence

---

[81] Raymond Brown *The Death of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1994) I 58-9; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 1991) 154.

[82] Naturally, it also suggests that the post-Easter crowds were Jewish. This issue will be treated in Chapter Twelve below.

[83] Twelve of the seventy-seven occurrences of the word in the NT are found in Matthew. Matthew has introduced the word at least six times: 2:6, 9:33; 10:6; 15:24,31; 27:9.

[84] W. Gutbrod, "Ἰσραήλ" *TDNT* III 369-70; Graham Harvey, *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 234-38; H. Kuhli, "Ἰσραήλ" *EDNT* II 203.

[85] Carson, *Matthew*, 88.

[86] Matthew 2:20-1 is exceptional in referring to the "land of Israel" (though cf. 10:23). The designation is probably an echo of "land of Egypt" at Exodus 4:20, designed to produce parallelism between the accounts of Jesus and Moses.

of "Israel" here means more than simply, "Within the geographical framework of Israel this is unique."[87] Rather, as the temporal indicator "never" suggests, there is a reference to *Heilsgeschichte*, to God's dealings with Israel. Within the scope of God's dealings with his people, Jesus' actions are unique.[88] The crowds as the present-day exemplars of Israel duly attest to the fact.

The second association of the crowds with Israel is situated in the midst of the healing and feeding account at 15:29-39 and relates that the crowds "glorified the "God of Israel."[89] Their use of the appellation "God of Israel" has frequently been taken as an indication that the crowds here are Gentiles, since, it is alleged, Jews would simply "praise God."[90] Additional reasons for supposing the crowds to be Gentiles are adduced as well. The setting of the feeding and healing is often thought to be the eastern (i.e., gentile) side of the Sea of Galilee. Further, when this feeding is compared with that of the five thousand, the latter ostensibly emerges as much more Jewish. The number of the leftover baskets—12, and the word used to denote these baskets—κόφινος—are typically Jewish.[91]

Unfortunately, none of these arguments is particularly weighty. The first is usually regarded as one of the more decisive, and, indeed, if it were the case that the Jewish people never referred to the God of Israel, it would be a potent argument. Yet, in fact it is non-Jews who almost never use the expression.[92] In the Hebrew Bible, by contrast, the appellation in various forms occurs some two hundred times, and only about five percent of these are actually found, or placed, in the mouths of non-Jews.[93] Hence, the expression "God of Israel" would be precisely what one would anticipate of a Jewish crowd, particularly a crowd praising the God of Israel. Their acclamation has an obvious liturgical stamp to it.[94]

---

[87] Cf. Harvey, *True Israel*, 235#34.
[88] Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 144.
[89] See the more extensive discussion of 15:29-39 in Cousland, "Feeding," 1-23. For a list of scholars who regard the crowds as Gentiles, see Donaldson, *Mountain*, 261#42.
[90] Blomberg, *Matthew*, 245; Carson, *Matthew*, 357; France, *Matthew*, 234; Gundry, *Matthew*, 319.
[91] Warren J. Heard, "Magadan," *ABD* IV 463.
[92] Non-Jews would refer to the "god of the Jews." It is likely that the only non-Jewish reference to Israel before the Common Era is to Israel the patriarch, who is mentioned by Pompeius Trogus, *Philippic Histories* 36 *apud* Justin, *Epitome* 2.1-5.
[93] For further details, see Cousland, "Feeding," 17-19.
[94] Cf. the references to "God of Israel" in Pss 41:13; 59:5; 68:35; 69:6; 72:18; 106:48. The designation occurs in three of the five psalms marking the divisions of the Psalter (41:13; 72:18; 106:48), in each case in the final benediction or doxology.

The argument that the feeding transpired on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee is also questionable. To be sure, in Mark the second feeding is situated on that side of the lake. Jesus returned from "the region of Tyre, and went through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee, through the region of the Decapolis" (Mark 7:31). Matthew, however, eliminates Mark's convoluted itinerary. Jesus simply "went on" from the district of Tyre and Sidon "and passed along the Sea of Galilee" (καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 15:29a). Matthew has also changed Jesus' destination after the feeding, from Mark's Dalmanutha (Mark 8:10) to Magadan (15:39).[95] That the Pharisees and Sadducees approach Jesus in Magadan implies that he is on the western shore at this point. If so, the gospel gives no indication—as it frequently does—that Jesus has crossed over from the eastern shore. Rather, Matthew's emendations of Mark create the strong impression that Matthew has re-situated the feeding of the four thousand on the western shore, and provides no suggestion (as opposed to the first feeding; cf. Matt 14:34) that Jesus has ever been to the eastern side.

Finally, the argument about the baskets is arbitrary. Even granting the dubious supposition that twelve κόφινοι are indisputably Jewish, what evidence is there that seven σπυρίδες must necessarily connote Gentiles?[96] All told, therefore, the evidence demonstrates that the crowds in the feeding and healing narrative at 15:29-39 are Jewish. They praise the "God of Israel" precisely because they belong to the people of Israel. Their god, through Jesus, has exercised his covenantal care for them, and they give him glory in return. In both of those passages, therefore, where the crowds refer to Israel, they call to mind their own special status as God's people. They praise the God of Israel because they are a part of Israel. They invoke God's past dealings with the people of Israel precisely because they too are heir to those dealings.

I *Conclusion*

The foregoing discussion has attempted to establish Matthew's understanding of the ethnic constitution of the crowds. With one exception, the members of the crowds originate from regions that

---

[95] The location of both sites is unknown, a fact that may help to explain the profusion of textual variants associated with both place names.

[96] It is telling that there is no evidence for this interpretation of the baskets before the Fourth Century. It first occurs in Hilary of Poitiers' *Commentarius in Matthaeum* 15:7.

were popularly regarded as Jewish. Only the mention of the Decapolis gives grounds to the supposition that he included Gentiles in the crowds. Even in this instance, however, it is probable that he accounts the Decapolis part of Eretz Israel, given the region's one-time inclusion in the Davidic kingdom. All the other indications of the gospel demonstrate that Matthew assumes that the crowds are essentially Jewish. He depicts them as having Jewish scribes; when they refer to Israel or to the God of Israel, they disclose their own status as the people of Israel.

It is, of course, possible that Matthew envisages Gentiles among the crowds. Matthew's reference to the Decapolis could allow for the possibility. If so, however, this is the only point where the gospel explicitly affords such an impression. Otherwise, the indications throughout the gospel are invariably of Jewish groups.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER FOUR

A *The Relation of the Crowds to Israel*

If, as the last chapter maintains, the crowds are indeed Jewish, how do they function within the gospel as a whole? Are they to be construed as the anonymous backdrop to Jesus' ministry or do they assume a more prominent role? Given Matthew's refashioning of the crowds mentioned above, it is, perhaps, not unexpected that they should assume somewhat more prominence in his gospel. For one thing, the crowds are no longer anonymous. Matthew has accorded them an identity: they constitute a part of the people of Israel. Yet, in what sense are they a part of the people of Israel? The Gospel of Matthew uses the term "people" (λαός) with some frequency.[1] Are the crowds distinguished from the people, and if so, how? The following chapter sets out to assess the interrelationship between the crowds and the "people" in Matthew.

B *ὄχλος and λαός*

One of the reasons why the crowds need to be associated with the λαός is that Matthew himself does so.[2] After the prophetic passages in the first two chapters of the gospel, which predict Jesus' ministry to "his people" (1:21; 2:6; 4:16), the word λαός is next used in reference to Jesus' actual ministry. Jesus is described as healing "every sickness and every weakness "amongst the people" (ἐν τῳ λαῷ 4:23). Precisely at this juncture (4:25) Matthew suddenly begins to refer to the crowds and, barring formula citations, he, as narrator, does not use the word λαός in an unqualified sense again until 27:25, where the crowds join their leaders in assuming responsibility for Jesus' death. This verse follows immediately upon Matthew's last use of the word ὄχλος. Once the crowds have joined with their leaders—literally or symbolically—they are not heard from again.[3] What this means is that the entirety

[1] The word λαός occurs with the following frequency in the Synoptic Gospels: Matt 14 Mark 2 Luke 36.

[2] For the opposite position, cf. Mora (*Refus*, 38), who claims that "*le mot peuple, chez lui, n'est jamais synonyme de foule*" (italics his).

[3] Note, however, the presence of the qualifying genitive λαοῦ in "elders of the people" (21:23; 26:3) and the "chief priests and elders of the people" (26:47; 27:1). Further, at 26:5 reference to "the people" is put in the leaders' mouths. Whether the leaders do join with the crowds at 27:25 will be discussed further below.

of Jesus' public ministry is undertaken not to the people as such, but to the crowds as distinct from their leaders.[4]

The crowds, moreover, are never mentioned prior to Jesus' ministry. "Jerusalem and all Judaea...and all the region along the Jordan" go out to hear John the Baptist, but it is not crowds who experience the Baptist's invective as it is at Luke 3:7, but the Pharisees and Sadducees (3:7). In Matthew, the crowds are only mentioned after Jesus has begun his ministry, and, in the same way, once the crowds side with their leaders at 27:25, they are not mentioned again. Afterward, the leaders describe them as the λαός (27:64; cf. 26:5) and, finally, Matthew as narrator identifies them as "the Jews" (Ἰουδαίοις 28:15). What this observation suggests, therefore, is that Matthew has refracted his picture of the λαός into its constituent parts during the public ministry of Jesus.[5] The people of Israel can be divided into two camps—the "leaders of the people" and "the crowds."

Before elaborating further on this idea, it is obviously necessary for us to consider the parameters of λαός in Matthew, since its precise signification has fomented considerable debate.[6] Some commentators maintain that Matthew "never uses . . . [λαός] without the thought of the Jewish nation as such."[7] Others argue that only some of the occurrences of the word properly refer to Israel as such,[8] with the other instances of the word λαός simply referring to people in a generic sense, without there being a definite ethnic connotation.[9] Still others contend that, in order "to maintain the Church's own identity as λαός Matthew more than any other NT theologian denies this designation to Israel."[10] Given this spectrum of divergent views, it is evident that the question needs to be considered in some detail. The

[4] In the gospel of Luke, by contrast, λαός occurs with considerable frequency throughout Jesus' public ministry. See Kodell, "Luke's Use of *Laos*," 327-43.

[5] A number of scholars have remarked on the fact that Jesus' ministry to the crowds transpires between 4:23 and 27:25, that is to say between the first mention of Jesus' ministry to the λαός, and "all the people's" final rejection of him—cf. Garland, *Intention*, 140; Gibbs, "Purpose," 451; Alfred Suhl, "Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium," *ZNW* 59 (1968) 78. Suhl further contends that ἐν τῷ λαῷ has been omitted from 9:35 (cf. the parallel at 4:23) precisely to bring about this configuration.

[6] H. Strathmann et al., "λαός" *TDNT* IV 29-57. Mark's two uses of the word are both paralleled in Matthew: Mark 7:7 // Matt 15:8; Mark 14:2 // Matt 26:5.

[7] J. A. Fitzmyer, "Anti-Semitism and the Cry of 'All the People' (Mt 27:25)," *TS* 26 (1965) 669; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 80; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 121; Mora, *Refus*, 36-9 (though he would except 1:21).

[8] Strathmann ("λαός" 51) states that 4:23; 26:5; 27:25 and 27:64 are without an ethnic connotation; Frankemölle ("λαός" *EDNT* II 340) singles out 4:23; 26:5; 27:64.

[9] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 32-33.

[10] Frankemölle, "λαός," 343.

examination below, therefore, will attempt to assess the ethnic signification of the word in all of its occurrences in the gospel. As Suhl in his analysis of the word has conveniently isolated five distinctive nuances in Matthew, his grouping will serve as the departure point for our discussion:

1. In the phrase ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ (2.4) or οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ (21:23; 26:3; 26:47; 27:1).
2. In four fulfilment citations (2:6; 4:16; 13:15; 15:8).
3. In the mouths of the Jewish leadership (26:5; 27:64).
4. In the redactional verses at 4:23 and 27:25.
5. In the mouth of the angel (1:21).[11]

1. The first category features Matthew's usage of λαός in relation to the ruling body in Jerusalem. Matthew, as narrator, relates how Herod consults all the "chief priests and scribes of the people" when he wishes to ascertain where the Messiah was to be born (2:4). Similarly, Matthew frequently refers to the "elders of the people" (21:23; 26:3) or to the "chief priests and elders of the people" (26:47; 27:1). His use of λαός as a qualifier signifies not simply that they were "leaders of the people" but "leaders of the people of Israel."[12] While local leaders or elders often made up the councils in most of the larger towns, it is not they who are in view.[13] Because Matthew only ever uses these phrases of groups situated in Jerusalem, it must be the members of the ruling elite in Jerusalem who are meant—that is to say, the ruling elite of Israel.

Whether, taken historically, this elite would have comprised the Sanhedrin depends on how that body is defined. On a conventional reading, they would have constituted the Sanhedrin.[14] Sanders, however, has recently argued that *the* Sanhedrin as such did not exist. He contends that the Sanhedrin that condemned Jesus was but one of a series of *ad hoc* councils, convened as circumstances required.[15] Even on his reading, however, the chief priests, elders, and scribes of the people would mean the *de facto* leaders of the nation.

These groups functioned in Israel's history as the Jewish leaders of the people, and, clearly, that is their role in Matthew's gospel.

---

[11] Suhl, "Davidssohn," 77.

[12] See the related expressions in the LXX: Exod 19:7; Num 11:16,24; 1 Macc 7:33; 12:35.

[13] For local councils, see Matt 10:17; for local elders, see Luke 7:3, and cf. *HJP* II 184-85.

[14] E.g., *HJP* II 213.

[15] Sanders, *Judaism*, 472-90. His corrective, while salutary, tends to discount the Mishnaic evidence too summarily.

Matthew consistently portrays them as the leaders of Israel. At 2:4, the scribes, the acknowledged experts on the law, provide Herod with the information he requires. As for the chief priests (together with the chief priest himself), they figure both as the religious leaders of Israel and the temporal leaders.[16] They are usually listed first in the gospel record, and they are the ones who put Jesus on trial. They also act as the liaison with Pilate.[17] Hence, in these occurrences of the word, there is an undoubted ethnic connotation: λαός refers to Israel.

2. Matthew's use of λαός in fulfilment citations likewise indicates that he has Israel in mind.[18] Matthew 2:6, a composite citation of Micah 5:1 and 2 Samuel 5:2, makes the association explicit when it refers to "my people Israel." In the latter passage, the Lord is addressing David, and his reference to "my people" is explicitly equated with Israel (εἶπε κύριος πρὸς σέ σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ). Here, God's people and Israel are one, and the same.[19] As Rothfuchs has noted, Matthew appears to have produced a composite citation precisely to equate "my people" with "Israel." Both Ἰσραὴλ and ποιμαίνειν are already present in the context of the Micah passage (5:2-4); Matthew has gone on to add 2 Samuel 5:2 to emphasize Jesus' mission to Israel, God's (and his) people.[20]

Less straightforward, perhaps, is the fulfilment citation at 4:15-16, which mentions Galilee of the gentiles—"the people (λαός) who sat in darkness have seen a great light." Some scholars regard the reference to the gentiles as an indication that the people referred to are not Israelites. Frankemölle, for instance, finds in the citation a reference to "the pagan world."[21] The problem with this interpretation is that Galilee at the time of Jesus was regarded as Jewish.[22] Matthew uses the citation to justify the otherwise inexplicable emergence of the

---

[16] "Chief priests" is merely the plural form of "chief priest." Whether the plural refers to a priestly aristocracy (Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 178) or to previous incumbents of the high priestly office (*HJP* II 233) is still in dispute (though see *HJP* II 236).

[17] It is possible that the "notables" (οἱ γνώριμοι) to whom Josephus frequently refers are to be identified with the elders.

[18] The term "fulfilment citation" is used loosely here, since, strictly speaking, 2:6 does not mention fulfilment, perhaps because it is placed in the mouths of high priests and scribes.

[19] Miler, *Les Citations*, 41.

[20] Wilhelm Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung* (WMANT V 8; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969) 61; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 137.

[21] Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 201.

[22] DA I 383-85; Freyne, *Galilee*, 138-45; Horsley, *Galilee*, 50-51 (though he would distinguish Galileans from Judeans); Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 194-196; *HJP* II 184.

Messiah from the region of Galilee. One could conceivably interpret the passage proleptically, but even here, Matthew has substituted the aorist for the future tenses found in the LXX to stress that the prophecy has *already* been fulfilled. The people of Israel in Galilee have already seen a great light; for them, the light has already dawned. Jesus is in their midst and on the point of embarking upon his Galilean ministry to Israel. Thus, λαός here is evidently a reference to Israel.[23]

If 13:15 is a genuine fulfilment citation,[24] the context of the passage indicates that the λαός of Isaiah 6:9 refers to the crowds alone. Jesus speaks to his disciples about the crowds (cf. 13:1-2 with 13:10-11) when he asserts: "this people's heart has grown dull, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." The Jewish leaders do not figure at all in the Parable discourse, nor, apart from 27:25, are the crowds ever associated with their leaders.[25] While such a negative depiction of the crowds is somewhat out of keeping with the tenor of the gospel at this point, it is they as the people of Israel who are upbraided for their obduracy.

In the fulfilment citation of 15:8, however, the reverse situation applies. While the crowds are present, it is the Pharisees and scribes, who are stigmatized in Jesus' fulfilment citation: "This people (λαός) honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me (Is 29:13)."[26] That the crowds do not figure in Jesus' rebuke is strongly suggested by three factors. First, it is the Pharisees and scribes, who emerge as Jesus' interlocutors (15:1). It is likely, therefore, that Jesus' rebuke is aimed at them. Second, the scribes and Pharisees would naturally be concerned with their own laws—a concern one would hardly impute to crowds possessed of limited understanding. Finally, Matthew's Jesus never condemns the crowds as hypocrites, whereas, it is a recrimination that he frequently levels at the scribes and Pharisees (23:13,14,15,23,25,27,29). Although the crowds once more show themselves to be without understanding, Jesus attempts to

[23] DA I 384-5; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 98; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 128. The citation's mention of "those who sat in the region and shadow of death" must surely encompass all Israel.

[24] See Ivor Harold Jones (*The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary* [NovTSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 1995] 283-7) for a useful discussion. Reasons for assuming the genuineness of 13:15 will be given below in the chapter devoted to Matthew 13 (Chapter Eleven). This chapter will also consider the somewhat anomalous depiction of the crowds that is to be found in the Parable discourse.

[25] It is possible that the "Jews" at 28:15 also include the leaders, although it is, perhaps, more in keeping with Matthew's portrayal to suppose that subsequent leaders continued to be privy to the deception practised by their predecessors.

[26] Like 2:6, 15:8 is not strictly a fulfilment citation. Cf. further, DA II 525-526.

redress the problem by enjoining them to "hear and understand" (15:10). The Pharisees and scribes, by contrast, are derided as hypocrites for heeding their own laws instead of those of God. The passage would suggest, then, that the λαός in this citation refers to the scribes and Pharisees as distinct from the crowds.[27]

In the above fulfilment citations, therefore, λαός can refer to the people of Israel as a whole, but it need not. In two of the citations attributed to Jesus, λαός is directed at one constituent of the Jewish people. At 15:8, in particular, the crowds are remarkable for not being included in Jesus' condemnation, although they are present. Similarly, at 13:15, the crowds can be described as "this people" in the absence of their leaders. What these findings suggest is that both groups are, in some way, representative of Israel. A similar impression emerges from an examination of the term "leaders of the people." In one sense, the designation indicates that they comprise part of the people of Israel, that they are its recognized leaders. In another sense, however, especially when they themselves speak of "the people," they dissociate themselves from those whom they oversee.

3. The same phenomenon can be seen more clearly in the third group of Suhl's passages, 26:5 and 27:64, both of which feature the leaders referring to "the people." In the former, "the chief priests and elders of the people" (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ 26:3) determine to arrest Jesus and kill him, "but they said, 'Not during the feast, lest there be a tumult among the people (ἐν τῷ λαῷ 26:5).'" At 26:5, the "people" are referred to in a generic sense. Yet, even in this instance there is an underlying ethnic substrate. The presence of the word λαός at 26:3—"chief priests and elders *of the people*"—establishes the interpretive context for the second occurrence of the word. The official representatives of Israel may be speaking of the people generically, but there is no doubt that this generic "people" is the "people of Israel."

It is probable that 27:64 has much the same import.[28] The chief priests and Pharisees again refer to "the people." In this instance, they are not specifically described as being leaders "of the people," but the association (for the chief priests at least), has by this point in the gospel become well established (cf. 2:4; 21:23; 26:3,47; 27:1). Here the chief priests and Pharisees want to prevent the disciples from stealing Jesus' body, and telling "the people" that Jesus had risen from the dead. Once more, the Pharisees and high priests refer

[27] Here the description of the leaders as "this people" may well reflect the use of "this generation" in the gospel (cf. 12:39; 16:2).

[28] Like 26:5, 27:64 is a Matthean creation; cf. Mark 14:2.

to the λαός in a generic sense, though there is a clear suggestion that the people of Israel are intended, as the passage can hardly be taken to refer to Gentiles. As the formal representatives of Israel, the leaders speak of the λαός in a generic sense with an underlying ethnic connotation. Hence, the people, like the leaders who speak about them, are Israelites.[29]

4. The fourth set of passages consists of what Suhl terms the "redactional" verses at 4:23 and 27:25. Matthew introduces the first (4:23) to emphasize the fulfilment of the prophecy at 4:16 (and possibly 2:6 as well). "Galilee" and λαός are the *Stichwörter* that connect 4:23 with verse 4:16, and elaborate on the significance of the light mentioned seven verses earlier.[30] It is probable, therefore, that the people who were mentioned at verse 16 are still very much in view. "Among the people" means "among the people of Israel in Galilee."

The second passage, 27:25, is perhaps the most notorious verse in the gospel, and, increasingly, one of the most hotly debated.[31] In the Passion Narrative, at 27:25, Matthew relates that πᾶς ὁ λαός accept responsibility for Jesus' death: "And all the people answered, 'His blood be on us and on our children.'" The question at issue is whether "all the people" should be interpreted literally or metaphorically. As Matthew has just spoken of the crowd in 27:24, it is possible that they alone are in view.[32] Yet, the reference at 27:20 to the chief priests and elders, who incite the crowds, makes it more probable that they join with the crowds as "all of the people." Since it is Matthew as the narrator who refers to the people on this occasion, and not the leaders, it is likely he does not exclude the chief priests and elders. This being so, what precisely does "all of the people" signify? Does it simply encompass all of the people massed before Pilate's judicial bench, or does it have a corporate frame of reference?

Kosmala and Saldarini, among others, favour the first position.[33] Kosmala contends that λαός means nothing more than the crowd

[29] Mora, *Refus*, 38. The ethnic connotation is suggested by 28:15. The verse observes that the chief priests' and elders' lie about the disciples stealing Jesus' body "has been spread among the *Jews* to this day"(my italics).
[30] Senior, *Passion*, 259. Citron ("Multitudes," 409) offers a different view. For the messianic signification of light, see Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 127-8.
[31] Senior, *Matthew*, 170.
[32] Note the πάντες of 27:22, which likely refers to the crowds.
[33] Hans Kosmala, "His Blood on Us and our Children (the Background of Matt. 27:24-25)," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 7 (1970) 96-99; Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 32-34. Cf. F. Lovsky, "Comment comprendre 'son sang sur nous et nos enfants'?," *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses* 62 (1987) 349.

mentioned in the previous verse. He acknowledges that "all the people" does have a representative sense in the Hebrew Scriptures on occasion, but asserts that in this instance the crowd is not the official representation of the whole Jewish people.[34] Saldarini's argument is similar, in that he maintains that πᾶς ὁ λαός is a "subgroup," consisting of "the bulk of Jews in Jerusalem, both the inhabitants and those there for the festival, who support Jesus' execution."[35] Saldarini claims that phrase is not representative because, in his view, it is only at the beginning of the gospel (1:21; 2:6; 4:16,23) that λαός has a theological sense.[36]

Neither view does full justice to the passage. Kosmala's claim that the phrase is not representative ignores the involvement of the chief priests and elders. If they are not representative of the people, then, who is? Even if the chief priests and elders are to be formally excluded from the "people" at 27:25, they, as the instigators of the crowds' response, are symbolically involved as the representatives of the Jewish people.[37] Hence, the leadership are, one way or another, included by the evangelist in the repudiation of Jesus, and can justly be taken as representatives of the people of Israel.

Further, both Kosmala and Saldarini fail to appreciate fully the notion of corporate responsibility in the Hebrew Scriptures. Joel Kaminsky has effectively demonstrated that the notion of corporate responsibility has been unduly downplayed by recent scholarship in favour of individual models of retribution.[38] Yet, as Kaminsky argues, conceptions of individual and corporate responsibility co-existed, and ideas of corporate responsibility continued to be influential through the period of Second Temple Judaism and beyond.[39]

It is probable, moreover, that Matthew is drawing upon this understanding. His phrase "all the people" has notable points of con-

[34] Kosmala, "Blood," 97-98.

[35] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 32-33. Amy-Jill Levine ("Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of Matthew" in William R. Farmer (ed.), *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels* [Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999] 34) adopts the related position of assuming that it means "all the people of Jerusalem."

[36] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 29, 32.

[37] Raymond Brown, *Death* I 836.

[38] Joel S. Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSup 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 179-89.

[39] Kaminsky, *Corporate Responsibility*, 138. Kaminsky specifically cites Matthew 23:29-36 as an example, although he does not discuss 27:25. There is an interesting parallel in Roman practice. Fergus Millar (*The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* [Jerome Lectures 22; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998] 38) observes that the crowd assembled in the Forum to vote was understood to represent the entire *populus Romanus*. Brown (*Death* I 794) notes that the *synagein* used of the crowds at 27:17 "gives a more official tone to those present than Mark's *anabas*."

tact with the legal terminology of the Mosaic law.[40] For instance, Leviticus 24:10-16 stipulates that a blasphemer is to be put to death by "the whole community." Since Jesus is convicted of blasphemy by the chief priests and the whole council (26:65-6), "all the people" would indicate that "the whole community" had joined in the verdict of blasphemy.[41]

An even more notable parallel in the Torah is to be found in the repeated mention of "all the people" at Deuteronomy 27:14-26.[42] Moses stipulates that the Levites are to declare a number of curses to Israel, to which "all the people (כל-העם) shall say, 'Amen.'" (Deut 27:15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26). The twelve occurrences of this formula are striking. More striking yet is the exact verbal agreement between part of this formula as it occurs in the LXX and the people's response at 27:25: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐροῦσιν γένοιτο (LXX) compared to καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπεν κτλ. It is difficult to avoid the impression that Matthew is deliberately alluding to these references in Deuteronomy, and to the underlying notion of corporate responsibility.[43]

For this reason, Saldarini's refusal to acknowledge the passage's theological character is perplexing. If the term has theological import in its first four occurrences in the gospel, why, given the above echoes, should it be absent here? Does a literal reading categorically preclude a symbolic one? In this instance, it very probably does not. "All the people" means "all Israel."[44]

---

[40] Donald Senior, "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as a Test Case" in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; Leuven: University Press, 1997) 113-4.

[41] Brown, *Death*, I 837.

[42] Brown, *Death*, I 837; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 209.

[43] As will be shown below in the chapter devoted to the crowds' role in the Passion, Matthew probably regards "all the people's" acceptance of blood guilt "on us and our children" as the etiology for the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple.

[44] This is the view of the great majority of scholars. See the extensive list in Senior, *Passion*, 238#5 and to it add (among others): Frank W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) 531; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 210; Garland, *Intention*, 40; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, II 458; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 827; Hare, *Matthew*, 317; Harrington, *Matthew*, 390; J. P. Heil, *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 76; Keener, *Matthew*, 670-71; Kodell, "Laos," 334; Armin Kretzer, *Die Herrschaft der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Basileabegriff und Basileaverständnis im Matthäusevangelium* (SBM 10; Stuttgart: Echter KBW, 1971) 79#85; Luz, *Theology*, 135; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 220. See DA III 592 for a recent (and unconvincing) dissenting view. They acknowledge the allusions to Deut. 27:15-26 (p. 591) but then deny that all Israel is signified.

5. The final instance of λαός mentioned by Suhl is at 1:21, where the angel tells Joseph that Mary "will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins" (αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν). As with 27:25, the precise significance of λαός here is "remarkably controversial."[45] Not uncommonly, however, the people saved by Jesus are taken to be the new people of God, i.e., the church.[46] The exponents of this view argue that the passage appears to be modelled in part on Psalm 130:8—"And he will redeem Israel from all his iniquities" (LXX 129:8: καὶ αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ισραηλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτου). Significantly, the reference to Israel appears to be dropped in favour of "his people," a modification that could suggest that Israel is viewed as being distinct from "his people." Bornkamm, for instance, regards the reference to "his people" as preparing the way for "my church" at 16:18, and ultimately, the new ἔθνος at 21:43.[47]

Matthew 1:21 has also been taken to apply to the church because of its reference to Jesus saving his people from their sins. According to this view, the forgiveness of sins in Matthew is no longer a feature of John the Baptist's ministry (cp. Mark 1:4 with Matt 3:1-12), but is confined exclusively to Jesus. The theme culminates with the institution of the Last Supper, where, in a notable addition to Mark (Matt 26:28; cf. Mark 14:24), Jesus' blood is poured out for many "*for the forgiveness of sins.*" The association of the forgiveness of sins with the Eucharist creates the strong presumption that the people whom Jesus saves from their sins is the Christian church. They participate in the Eucharist, and thereby participate in Jesus' salvation of them from their sins. In this light, 1:21 is often regarded as proleptic, anticipating the new people of God.

Further support for this viewpoint is provided by a reading of 21:43, which, likewise, speaks of the new people of God. Jesus says to the chief priests and the Pharisees: "the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people that produces the fruits of the kingdom." Here, the new people, composed of Jews as well as Gentiles, is conceived of as an entity distinct from Israel. Thus, at 1:21, λαόν αὐτοῦ does not refer primarily to Israel (God's people), but

---

[45] Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 211: "ausserordentlich umstritten."

[46] Bornkamm, *Tradition*, 325; DA I 210; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 211-18; J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1976) 44#20; Anton Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn: Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts– und Kindheitsgeschichte* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971) 85.

[47] Bornkamm, *Tradition*, 325.

the people to whom he has given the kingdom, the people whose sins he has forgiven (Jesus' people).

Yet, the above interpretation ignores the context of the verse. As seventeen of the verses that precede 1:21 are devoted to an elaboration of Jesus' genealogy, it seems rather unnecessary to propose a people other than the one Matthew has already—and lengthily—furnished. That the angel appears to Joseph precisely to guarantee Jesus' adoption by Joseph and his identity as a "son of David" makes a rival interpretation superfluous.

In addition, while there is no doubt that Jesus' forgiveness is most clearly instantiated in the context of the church through the Eucharist, at the same time Matthew indicates that Jesus' forgiveness and salvific acts were lavished upon Israel first. The pericope at 9:1-8, transpiring in Jesus' "own city," for instance, is the only one in the gospel where Jesus expressly saves someone from his sins. Surely, Jesus came to save Israel's sins. It may well be that this authority was later imparted to the community, as 9:8 suggests, but only after the community became the new people of God. That is to say, the overall narrative context of the passage does not preclude an interpretation at the "historical" level of the gospel—it positively encourages one.

Most telling of all, however, is the language that Jesus uses to describe this new people of God. Verse 21:43 is generally regarded as the *locus classicus* of this transaction. Remarkably, though, the passage uses the word ἔθνος. The verse does not say, "I will give the kingdom to a λαός producing the fruits of it," but, "to a nation (ἔθνει) producing the fruits of it." As the entire verse is a Matthean creation, the choice of terminology is evocative. The fact that he makes no reference to λαός argues that Matthew does not understand his community as a "new Israel," a new λαός, but as "a 'third race' (*tertium genus*) over against both Jews and Gentiles."[48] As this new ἔθνος is effectively equivalent to the "church," the latter is to be distinguished from the λαός. As a consequence, Matthew 1:21 is best taken as a reference to the Jewish people.[49]

In conclusion, therefore, it is possible to say that the dominant interpretation of λαός in Matthew's gospel is an ethnic one. The "people" in Matthew are, explicitly or implicitly, Israelites. There is

---

[48] Stanton, *New People*, 11-12; cf. B. Charette, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNTSup 79; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 137-38; Harvey, *True Israel*, 237; Luz, *Theology*, 119-20; Alan F. Segal, "Matthew's Jewish Voice" in Balch, *Social History of the Matthean Community*, 23-24; Strecker, *Weg*, 33.

[49] See further the careful discussion of Miler (*Citations*, 27-9) who concludes that "Le λαός est donc le peuple d'Israël" (p. 29).

scant support for Frankemölle's supposition that λαός refers to the Christian community. Rather, Fitzmyer's claim that the Jewish people are always in view when Matthew uses λαός is far more apt. Matthew's λαός refers to the people of Israel, even if it does not always denote the people as a whole. The term can refer to the crowds, to the leaders or to Galileans. In each case, however, these groups are evidently regarded as constitutive of Israel, just as "all the people" is symbolically synonymous with Israel.[50]

Such an analysis fits well with the above suggestion that the crowds can be understood as a component of the λαός. Whether the crowds are synonymous with the people depends largely on the context. In the mouth of the "leaders of the people," λαός does refer to the crowds. On other occasions, as at 27:25, the crowds and their leaders together comprise the people. The situation that prevails through most of the gospel, however, is one where the λαός is refracted, and the crowds and their leaders are distinguished from each other.

C *The Crowds as Sheep*

The above finding is further corroborated by Matthew's metaphorical depiction of the crowds as sheep. At 9:36, Matthew relates that when Jesus saw the crowds, "he had compassion for them, because they were harassed and helpless, like sheep without a shepherd." The simile is one of the most important descriptions of the crowds that the gospel provides; images of sheep and shepherd occur with considerable frequency, even if their overall importance has been little remarked upon.[51]

Within the synoptic tradition, Matthew's focus on the term is out of the ordinary, as is his figurative deployment of the imagery. Where the pastoral references in Luke are not, with the virtual exception of

---

[50] Compare Harvey's (*True Israel*, 237) remarks on the word "Israel" in Matthew: "included under this name are Judaeans, Galileans, the leaders of the people and the followers of Jesus."

[51] Aland (*Spezielübersichten*, 230) lists the following occurrences of πρόβατον in the gospels: Matt 11 Mark 2 Luke 2 John 19. See J. H. Friedrich, "πρόβατον" *EDNT* III 152-53; Kingsbury, *Structure,* 87-88; H. Preisker and S. Schulz, "πρόβατον κτλ" *TDNT* VI 689-92; Wilfred Tooley, "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus," *NovT* 7 (1964-65) 15-25. Missing in these accounts, particularly in the last ("there are *only* six 'shepherd sayings' in this gospel appart [*sic*] from two parables using the imagery," 19 italics mine) is an explanation for the profusion of the image in the first gospel. Francis Martin's study ("The Image of the Shepherd in the Gospel of Sant [*sic*] Matthew," *Science et Esprit* 27 (1975) 261-301) by contrast, does recognize the importance of the motif in Matthew.

the parable of the lost sheep (Luke 15:4,6 cf. Luke 12:32), usually figurative,[52] the converse is true for Matthew. Only Matthew 12:11-12 refers to sheep in a literal sense. The nine other occurrences of πρόβατον in the gospel are metaphorical, and it is evident that Matthew has drawn from the common store of pastoral imagery in the Hebrew Scriptures, and appropriated similes, metaphors and phrases that were very familiar.[53]

In the Hebrew Bible, for the great majority of cases, the sheep represent Israel,[54] as the "sheep of his pasture,"[55] with the shepherd as God,[56] or his representatives, the king or leaders.[57] While some of these passages address the idyllic relationship between shepherd and flock, more commonly, the images are used to depict the afflictions suffered by the sheep, often at the hands of worthless shepherds.[58] The sheep are lost and scattered (Ps 44:11; Is 53:6; Jer 10:21; 23:1-2; 50:6; Ezek 34:4-6; Zech 11:16), sick (Ezek 34:4), maimed (Ezek 34:4; Zech 11:16), weak (Ezek 34:4), unfed (Ezek 34:8; Zech 11:16), slaughtered (Ps 44:22), devoured (Jer 50:7; Ezek 34:3,5,8; Zech 11:16), and perishing (Zech 11:16).[59]

The above metaphor pervades the Scriptures,[60] but is most prominent in the account elaborated in Ezekiel 34, a passage that

---

[52] Luke 2:8 (*bis*),15,18, 20; 17:7.

[53] The sheep and shepherd motif is not only common in the Hebrew Bible, but throughout the Ancient Near East. For Mesopotamian and classical parallels, see J. D. Turner, "The history of religions background of John 10" in J. Beutler and R. T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context* (SNTSMS 67; Cambridge: University Press, 1991) 35-40; for Egyptian usage: D. Müller, "Der gute Hirte: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte ägyptischer Bildrede," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, 86 (1961) 126-44.

[54] Num 27:17; 2 Sam 24:17 // 1 Chron 21:17; Pss 77:20; 78:52; Isa 63:11; Jer 13:20.

[55] Jer 23:1; Pss 74:1; 79:13; cf. 95:7; 100:3; Zech 9:16.

[56] Gen 49:24; cf. 48:15; Pss 23:1; 28:9; 79:13; 80:1; Isa 40:11; Jer 31:10; Ezek 34:11-22; Micah 7:14.

[57] 2 Sam 7:7 // 1 Chron 17:6; Isa 56:11; Jer 2:8; 3:15; 10:21; 22:22; 23:1-4; 25:34-36; 50:6; Ezek 34:2-10; Zech 10:3; 11:4-17; David: 1 Sam 17:34-35; cf. Ezek 34:23; Moses: Exod 3:1; Ps 77:20; cf. Philo, *Mos.* I 60-65.

[58] Arland J. Hultgren (*The Parables of Jesus. A Commentary* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000) 52.

[59] On the distinctive elaboration of these themes in Zechariah, see Iain Duguid, "Messianic Themes in Zechariah 9-14" in Philip E. Satterthwaite et al. (eds.), *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995) 269-75.

[60] For a detailed assessment of many of these passages, see Bernd Willmes, *Die sogenannte Hirtenallegorie Ez 34: Studien zum Bild des Hirten im Alten Testament* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984). See, in addition, the extensive allegory in 1 Enoch, chapters 88-90.

likely influenced Matthew considerably.[61] The parable of the lost sheep may have been modified under its influence,[62] and the "parable" of the sheep and the goats (Matt 25:31-46) seemingly reflects the judgement between the strong and weak sheep at Ezekiel 34:17-22.[63] Bammel finds echoes of Ezekiel 34 at both Matthew 8:34 and 10:6.[64] To the latter passage, which will be discussed shortly, can likely be added the healing and feeding complex at 15:29-39, which will also be treated below.

To return, then, to the simile at 9:36: Matthew has appropriated it from Mark 6:34 and resituated it before his Mission discourse (10:1-42). Given that Matthew's passage is obviously drawn from Mark, and that it is the only occasion where the crowds are explicitly associated with sheep, the verse has not occasioned much notice. Yet, the positioning of the simile in proximity to Jesus' directive to confine the mission to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel"(10:6) is highly suggestive, and indicates that the two verses are meant to inform one another. The "sheep" at 9:36 are to be associated with the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" mentioned at both 10:6 and 15:24.

Naturally, it is not possible to demonstrate categorically that the two groups are one and the same, but a number of features do suggest that they are identical. One such feature is the conjunction of 9:36 with 10:6. To bring about this configuration, Matthew has had to recombine a number of disparate elements to fashion his Mission discourse and its preamble. A detailed examination will show that this is the case. Most of the editorial summary of Jesus' activity (9:35) is appropriated from Mark 6:34.[65] There it was originally situated after the return of the disciples from their mission (Mark 6:30) in the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand. Matthew pulls the pericope forward so that it provides the basis for the disciples' mission, and follows it with the great harvest logion, which he has culled from the

---

[61] John Paul Heil ("Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and the Sheep in Matthew," *CBQ* 55 (1993) 699) has independently demonstrated how fundamental Ezekiel 34 is to a proper appreciation of Matthew's metaphor.

[62] In possible dependence on Ezekiel 34, Matthew 18:12 features the editorial inclusion of "on the mountains" (ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη).

[63] For a dissenting view, see Kathleen Weber, "The Image of the Sheep and the Goats in Matthew 25:31-46," *CBQ* 59 (1997) 671-73. She appears to discount the possibility of any innovative use of imagery on Matthew's part.

[64] Ernst Bammel, "The Feeding of the Multitude" in E. Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics of his Day* (Cambridge: University Press, 1984) 217#43. Why he should include 8:34 is obscure to me.

[65] While some (e.g., Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 64) have seen 9:35 as the conclusion to the miracle sequence (8:1-9:34), it is best understood as a hinge verse connecting Jesus' ministry with that of his disciples.

mission charge in Q (Luke 10:2).[66] It, too, serves to provide a basis for the mission, and explains the reference to "laborers" in the next verse.[67] Matthew then constructs the beginning of the Mission discourse from Mark 6:7and Mark 3:13-19a, and adds Matt 10:5-6, a passage unique to his gospel.[68]

What is particularly suggestive about the construction of this passage, therefore, is the contiguity of 9:36 with 10:5.[69] The arrangement must be attributed to Matthew's editing. Even if, as Schürmann maintains, 10:5b-6 functioned as the introduction to Luke 10:8-11—an assumption that does not seem overly probable—Matthew's activity is still sufficiently evident with respect to the placement of 9:36.[70]

---

[66] Matthew has taken the passage from the mission charge in Q // Luke 10:2-3 (cf. D. Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* [WMANT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969] 59-60) so that here the urgent need of labourers is expressly related to the crowds.

[67] B. Charette ("A Harvest for the People? An Interpretation of Matthew 9.37f.," *JSNT* 38 (1990) 29-35) makes the attractive proposal that Matthew has reinterpreted the passage in light of Hosea 6:11 to suggest that the labouring disciples are not so much harvesters as emissaries who bring the blessings of the messianic age to Israel. Charette is surely correct in his claim (against Daniel Patte, *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987] 142) that the theme of judgement is not a feature of the harvest metaphor here.

[68] As is well known, the references to a particularist mission at 10:5-6 and 15:24 are unique to Matthew. Not surprisingly, there is a broad spectrum of opinion concerning the provenance of these passages. Some scholars regard one, or both, as dominical utterances. Joachim Jeremias (*Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 19-21, 26-28), for instance, has supported this view in his claim to have found traces of Aramaic underlying the Greek. See further, Klein, *Bewährung*, 202-3.

A second group of opinion holds that these passages were composed by Matthew himself. Heinrich Kasting (*Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission: Ein historische Untersuchung* [BevTh 55; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1969] 110), for instance, argues that Jeremias' alleged Aramaicisms can be explained just as well in light of Septuagintal Greek. Graham Stanton ("Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus" in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* [WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr, 1983] 276-277) has, in addition, pointed out the Matthean characteristics of these verses, arguing that they represent Matthew's "creative interpretation" of Mark. See further: Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 137-138.

Of these two positions, the latter appears the more promising. With the former, one has to ask why so many Mattheanisms occur in the reputed *ipsissima vox Jesu*. Acceptance of the latter position explains them, without precluding thereby an underlying awareness of tradition on Matthew's part.

[69] This contiguity is remarked upon by Beare, *Matthew*, 242; Carson, *Matthew*, 244; DA II 147-48; Keener, *Matthew*, 309; Amy-Jill Levine, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1988) 40; Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 90, and Schottroff, "Volk," 158, among others.

[70] Heinz Schürmann, "Mt 10, 5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes" in *idem*, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien: Beiträge* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1967) 148.

Naturally, if Matthew created 10:5-6, then he is responsible for the placement of both 9:36 and 10:5-6. Either way, then, the conjunction must be Matthean.[71]

The two verses, therefore, are deliberately juxtaposed. The intervening verses are necessary to establish the context of the discourse. Once, however, Jesus has assembled and empowered the twelve disciples for the mission, the very first charge he gives them is "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel" (10:5-6). The plight of the shepherdless sheep impels him to institute the mission, and the mission is conducted entirely for the sake of the "lost sheep" of Israel.[72]

Not only are the verses contiguous, there is an obvious similarity in imagery. The figures of speech in the two verses, while not precisely identical, disclose a related underlying meaning, as can be determined from an examination of similar passages in the Hebrew Scriptures. Apart from the obvious sheep imagery,[73] there are two other points of comparison. The first is that the two groups are depicted as being without leadership. While it is explicit at 9:36, the "lostness" of the sheep at 10:6 is also attributable in the Hebrew Bible to the want of proper leadership. Jeremiah 50:6, for instance, makes this association explicit: "My people have been lost sheep; their shepherds have led them astray."[74] The same idea underlies Ezekiel 34—the shepherds' dereliction of duty brings about the scattering of the sheep (Ezek 34:5-6). The lost sheep and leaderless sheep, then, are effectively the same group.

The second point of comparison between the two passages is that they employ corporate imagery. In 9:36 the crowds are "sheep without a shepherd." The expression is a familiar one in the Hebrew Bible (Num 27:17; I Kings 22:17; 2 Chron 18:16; Ezek 34:5; cf. Jdt 11:19 and Josephus, *Ant.* 8.404), and is employed almost invariably as a metaphor for the people as a whole. In Numbers 27:17 (cf. Num 27:12), it is the "congregation" of Israel that is described, while in I

---

[71] Cf. DA II 147: "Matthew has moved the words [sc. 9:36b] from their place in Mark (6:34) because they link up so well with the imperative in 10:6."

[72] Note that 9:35, unlike its counterpart at 4:23, makes no mention of Galilee. It speaks simply, if hyperbolically, of "all the cities and villages." The impression it affords is of a ministry that begins to encompass all Israel (cf. 10:23).

[73] Num 27:17; 2 Sam 24:17 // 1 Chron 21:17; Ps 77:20; 78:52; Isa 63:11; Jer 13:20. The sheep imagery will be treated more fully below.

[74] Jeremiah 50:6 [LXX 27.6] reads: πρόβατα ἀπολωλότα ἐγενήθη ὁ λαός μου οἱ ποιμένες αὐτῶν ἔξωσαν αὐτούς ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη.

Kings 22:17 and its doublet at 2 Chronicles 18:16, it is the people of the kingdom of Israel; "all Israel" is scattered upon the mountains. In Ezekiel, the sheep are Yahweh's people ("my sheep" Ezek 34:6). Ezekiel has the Lord God add, "they shall know that…they, the house of Israel, are my people, says the Lord God. And you are my sheep, the sheep of my pasture" (Ezek 34:30-31). The metaphor of "sheep without a shepherd," therefore, is applied to the people corporately.

The same can be said for the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" at 10:6. If οἴκου Ἰσραήλ has occasionally been taken as a partitive genitive, which would signify that only a part of Israel was lost,[75] the context of the verse indicates that it is an epexegetical genitive, one referring to all of Israel.[76] The correlation of Israel with the "Gentiles" and the "Samaritans" in 10:5 (cf. 15:24), where all Israel is contrasted with these two other ethnic groups, imparts a national significance to the phrase. In addition, the expression "lost sheep" also occurs in the Hebrew Bible, where it generally has a corporate signification.[77]

The above point makes it likely that 9:36 should also be taken corporately. Not only does the scriptural echo of "sheep without a shepherd" at 9:36 evoke corporate Israel, so, too, does its conjunction with 10:6, which also refers to Israel. Obviously, this interpretation cannot apply to Mark's use of the same passage because he situates it in the feeding of the five thousand. The "sheep without a shepherd" in Mark are the five thousand. In contrast with Mark 6:34, however, Matthew's Jesus does not have simply one particular crowd of five thousand in view. Rather, as the placement of 9:36 after the editorial summary at 9:35 reveals, the passage applies to the crowds he has encountered in the course of his ministry, that is to say, to the crowds in general. In this instance, the crowds represent the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." The juxtaposition of the two passages and their use of common corporate metaphors suggest that they should be seen as informing each other. The crowds, in this instance, are metonymical for Israel.

Such a conclusion follows naturally from the identification of the crowds made in the last chapter—if they are accounted Jewish, they

---

[75] O. Cullmann, *Petrus: Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer: Das historische und das theologische Petrusproblem* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1952) 213.

[76] Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 128#226; Jeremias, *Promise*, 26#3 and most commentators.

[77] At Jeremiah 50:6, for instance, the prophet laments "My people have been lost sheep." Cf· Ezek 34:11,16; Isa 53:6.

must figure as part of the "lost sheep of Israel." They would be included in Jesus' charge to the disciples at 10:6 and in Jesus' own account of his mission (15:24), both of which are explicitly directed to the "lost sheep of the House of Israel." The crowds are thus identified by the gospel as errant sheep three times, once explicitly and twice implicitly. The conjunction of 9:35 with 10:6 simply makes the identification more vivid.

In reliance upon Ezekiel 34 and related scriptural passages, the evangelist uses the metaphor of the sheep to represent the people of Israel as being particularly needy. The above list of afflictions suffered by the sheep has remarkable similarities with the woes of the crowds. Like the shepherdless sheep, the crowds are lost and leaderless, sick, maimed, weak, unfed, and perishing, even if—literally at least—they are not being slaughtered or devoured.[78]

Matthew's use of the sheep image has a further referent. If the sheep are "lost" and "without a shepherd," then what is to be made of their ostensible leaders—the scribes, Pharisees, chief priests and elders? Matthew's implication is that they function as a type of the "evil shepherds of Israel," who mistreat their flock[79]. The indictment against the evil shepherds in Ezekiel 34, for instance, is remarkably apropos: "The weak you have not strengthened, the sick you have not healed, the crippled you have not bound up, the strayed you have not brought back, the lost you have not sought..." (Ezek 34:4). Matthew's Pharisees, for instance, notably fail to lead or care for the crowds, and they compound their guilt by seeking to prevent Jesus from healing them (9:32-34; 12:22-24), just as they balk at his seeking out of the lost (9:11). Not only do they blaspheme (12:31-2), but they also prevent those who would enter the Kingdom of heaven from entering it (23:13). They mislead their flock by "teaching as doctrines the precepts of men" (15:9). And, as Beaton has recently suggested, through their "insistence upon observance of their own strict halakic stipulations, the Pharisees were ultimately oppressing the people and leading them away from the very God to whom they claimed devotion."[80] He suggestively adds "Surely the shepherds of Israel in Matthew's perspective are not caring for the sheep placed in their care."[81]

[78] Schottroff, "Volk," 158.
[79] Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 109; Kingsbury, *Story*, 23-4.
[80] Richard Beaton, "Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42:1-4?," *JSNT* 75 (1999) 16.
[81] Beaton, "Messiah and Justice," 17.

The behaviour of Jesus as shepherd affords a vivid contrast.[82] Where the Pharisees had not cared for the flock, Jesus not only demonstrates his compassion and widespread concern (9:35), but also cares for the flock by summoning disciples to do precisely what he has already done in chapters 8 and 9. Ezekiel complains that there was "none to search or seek for" the sheep. Jesus' commissioning of the disciples rectifies this problem. The above passages, therefore, emerge with a number of suggestive features: the Davidic shepherd or shepherds, the ravaged flock of the people of God, and finally the culpable shepherds, who have neglected the flock. The last two groups, not surprisingly, conform to the picture of the refracted λαός mentioned at the outset of this chapter. The crowds correspond to the sheep and the leaders of the people to the irresponsible shepherds. The way is paved for Yahweh's promised leader of Israel, who will shepherd his people Israel (2:6).[83]

In conclusion, Matthew's comparison of the crowds to sheep draws on an established topos from the Hebrew Bible. The sheep are the people of Israel, as distinguished from their leadership. In fact, it is probable that Matthew's theologizing of the crowds has resulted from his reflection on Mark's description of the crowds as "sheep without a shepherd" (Mark 6:34). Once this description is interpreted in light of the Scriptures, it readily produces two groups: the leaders of Israel and the people they lead. The description of the crowds as sheep, therefore, conforms to the refracted view of the crowds presented above.

If the foregoing argument holds, however, does this mean that the ὄχλοι are a *terminus technicus* for the people of Israel? Yes and no. Matthew means to connote Israel by referring to the crowds, not to denote it. Without doubt, for instance, the use of ὄχλος at 9:23,25 would argue against any simple identification of the crowds with Israel. Even on a larger scale, however, the Galilean crowds hardly include the people of Jerusalem, nor would the crowds of four and five thousand comprise even a small fraction of Galileans. That is to say, at one level Matthew's understanding of the crowds does not depart from the view he inherited from Mark. The crowds can refer to specific groups of people from specific locations (4:23), attached at various points to Jesus' ministry, who assemble and are dismissed.

---

[82] On the role of the shepherd in Ezekiel 34, see Jean Rembry, "Le theme du berger dans l'oeuvre d'Ezechiel," *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum* 11 (1960/61) 113-44.

[83] See, as well, Charette, *Recompense*, 72-75.

Yet, having said that, it is evident that Matthew has added an additional stratum to his portrayal. The homogenization, globalization, and choric qualities that were remarked upon in Chapter Two above mean that the crowds can assume a representative role. The particular details so typical of the crowd in Mark's gospel are eliminated with the result that Matthew's ὄχλοι can evoke all of Israel. When Jesus heals and feeds the 5,000, he symbolically, *pars pro toto*, feeds all of his people. When he heals the crowds, he figuratively heals all of Israel. It is not simply that the crowds are a part or a subset of Israel. Rather, at determinative points in the gospel they are regarded as tantamount to all of Israel. As shall become evident below, this is most characteristically the case when the crowds pronounce on Jesus' identity.

As such, the position just outlined is not strikingly novel. Many scholars would hold that the pronouncement made at 27:25 by "all the people" is representative of the people of Israel. The view presented here simply contends that 27:25 is not unique within the gospel; Matthew uses the crowds to represent the people of Israel at other places as well,[84] particularly when the crowds comment on Jesus and his ministry. In short, as was already suggested in Chapter Two, Matthew theologizes the crowds. They respond to Jesus as the rank and file of Israel—Israel as distinguished from its leadership. The genius of Matthew's characterization is that he has added this extra register to the perspective he inherited. It enables him to retain the overall framework provided by Mark, but also to develop a separate frame where he can deal with the issue of Israel and salvation history.

D *Conclusion*

The above chapter has demonstrated that λαός is an ethnic designation and refers explicitly or implicitly to Israel. While ὄχλος is not strictly speaking synonymous with λαός, there is nevertheless a considerable semantic overlap. The crowds represent one refracted constituent of Israel while their leaders represent the other. During the course of Jesus' public ministry, from 4:23-27:25, these two groupings are invariably kept distinct.

---

[84] See, for instance, Heinz Giesen ("Krankenheilungen," 90-92), who argues for the representative character of the crowds at 4:25, and Jan Lambrecht (*Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 10; Louvain: Peeters, 1992) 178), who considers the crowds of Matthew 13 a "symbol of the people of Israel."

Matthew further uses the traditional image of lost sheep to characterize the crowds, and his use of pastoral imagery in the gospel is especially appropriate for elucidating the evangelist's understanding of the crowds. He consciously associates them with the House of Israel, who, like the people of Israel of old, suffer from deficient or malign leadership. Finally, while the crowds are occasionally representative of Israel, they do not denote Israel so much as connote it.

This page intentionally left blank

PART II

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this section of the work has been to explore the identity and constitution of the crowds. Chapter Two establishes several points. It determines that the crowds are a relatively consistent and coherent entity in the gospel, denoted by the term ὄχλος. Building on the depiction of the crowds in Mark and, to a much lesser extent, in Q, Matthew fashions a group to serve as a backdrop to the ministry of Jesus. While he appropriates several features from Mark, such as the following of the crowds, he changes them substantially. Some of the casual actions of the multitude in Mark are refashioned so that they become the defining characteristics of the Matthean ὄχλος. Leaving largely to one side the *realia* associated with the formation and break up of throngs of people, Matthew endues his crowds with distinctive traits. In so doing, he largely transforms the crowds into a literary creation with a decided theological cast. That the crowds refer to Jesus as the Son of David and prophet testifies to this transformation.

The third chapter demonstrates that the crowds are to be regarded as Jewish. Matthew 4:24-25 describes the crowds as coming from a number of regions, but only the Decapolis can be regarded as a distinctively gentile territory. Even here, it is highly probable that Matthew has interpreted it as a Jewish region, given its one-time inclusion in the Davidic kingdom. Certainly other indications of the crowds' ethnic identity in the gospel—the reference to the crowds' scribes at 7:29, as well as the crowds' references to Israel and the God of Israel—establish that Matthew regards them as Jewish.

The fourth chapter argues that the crowds are not only Jewish, but can be symbolic of all Israel apart from their leaders. The association of the ὄχλοι with λαός demonstrates that the terms are conceptually related. The crowds represent the people of Israel as distinct from their leaders over the course of Jesus' ministry. The same point is brought out by the conjunction of 9:36 with 10:5-6. The employment of the sheep image from the Hebrew Scriptures makes the association explicit. While there is no denying that the ὄχλοι still figure as the great (or not so great) masses on some occasions, they can and do assume a more profound and representative significance elsewhere in the gospel.

Hence, the most determinative feature of Matthew's identification of the crowds is the fact that they are Jewish. By making them Jewish, Matthew is able to characterize them using images drawn from the Hebrew Bible. His use of a topos that represents the crowds as "lost sheep" and "sheep without a shepherd" becomes programmatic for Matthew's portrayal of the crowds. It means that Matthew has added a diachronic (or salvation-historical) point of view to Mark's synchronic perspective. The crowds are no longer simply the fortunate bystanders to Jesus' public ministry. They are also the present exemplars of the covenant people of God, who, like their forbears, have suffered from bad leadership and await divine intervention. Just what the crowds' precise role and function as the people of Israel will be dealt with more fully in the sections below.

PART III

REX ET GREX

The previous section set out to establish the identity of the crowds, and determined that they were Jewish. The present section plans to address the ambiguous or ambivalent role of the crowds by concentrating upon the "favourable" portrayal of the ὄχλοι in relation to Jesus, while the next section will treat the "unfavourable" portrayal. As was noted in Chapter One, this favourable portrayal includes almost all of the crowds' sayings or the attributions made about them over the course of Jesus' public ministry. As these attributions and sayings are almost invariably responses to Jesus and his ministry, this section will begin with an overview of Jesus' ministry to the crowds. It will be followed by a chapter devoted to the crowds' reactions to Jesus' ministry, either astonishment or responses in direct speech. The next chapter will explore the crowds' "following" of Jesus, and consider whether it signifies allegiance to Jesus. The final chapter of the section will examine the crowds' use of the christological title Son of David to determine why it is put in the mouth of the crowds. Taken as a whole, the section will attempt to explain why it is that the crowds figure in such a sympathetic role within the narrative of Jesus' ministry.

As this sympathetic representation has led some scholars to suppose that the crowds' behaviour is not fundamentally different from that of the disciples, one purpose of this section will be to establish whether the role of the crowds ought to be distinguished from the disciples, and, if so, precisely how it is to be distinguished. In addition, since there exists no agreement among scholars concerning the import of terms such as "following" or "Son of David," or, for that matter, the various words denoting astonishment that Matthew employs, a considerable part of our discussion will be devoted to establishing an appropriate Matthean context for these terms. Once this has been determined, it will be possible to assess how these terms apply to the crowds in specific instances.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER FIVE

A *Jesus' Ministry to the Crowds*

The previous section determined that the crowds are both constituent and representative of Israel. The next question that emerges concerns Jesus' precise relationship to Israel, and specifically, the parameters and focus of his ministry. Notoriously, Matthew's gospel contains two missionary charges. Typically, the tension between 10:5-6 on the one hand, and 28:19 on the other, has been resolved in two ways. One solution has been to attribute the opposing views to opposing groups or traditions within Matthew's church.[1] The other has been to reconcile the antithetical positions within the context of *Heilsgeschichte*. Since it was assumed above that 10:5 and 15:24 are actually editorial creations, the second alternative emerges as the more satisfactory. Matthew conceives of the post-Easter phase, where all authority has been granted to Jesus, as being different from the pre-Easter period. The disparity between the two phases accounts for the difference in mission charges: they are to be reconciled within the framework of salvation history. Given that the *heilsgeschichtlich* view is by far the more influential in Matthean studies, there is little need to defend it fully here.[2]

B *The Character of the Ministry*

As was just noted above, the crowds' sayings and actions are almost entirely responses to Jesus' ministry. An appreciation of Jesus' ministry to the crowds will, therefore, make it easier to assess their responses, and should have the additional benefit of helping to characterize the crowds by using Jesus' actions toward them as a sort of mirror. This chapter will consider four of Jesus' characteristic actions—proclamation, teaching, healing, and feeding—in relation to the crowds, and will finish with a discussion of Jesus' role as shepherd.

---

[1] See E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" in *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM, 1969) 82-107; Schuyler Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel," *ST* 31 (1977) 21-32; *idem*, "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 9:35-11:1)," *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90; and *idem*, "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission," *NovT* 22 (1980) 193-221.

[2] For detailed discussion, see A.-J. Levine, *Salvation History*; Meier, *Law*; Senior, *Matthew*, 45-52; and DA II 167-8, the last of whom adduce Matt 9:14-15 and 17:9 as indications of a change in circumstances after the resurrection.

Part of Jesus' activity amongst the crowds can be epitomized by the summaries Matthew himself furnishes at 4:23 and 9:35 (cf. 11:1)—"teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom and healing every disease and infirmity."[3] Bultmann includes these summaries among the "editorial comments that Matthew adds to Mark,"[4] and, as such, they are designed to express the essence of Jesus' ministry. While the summaries do not explicitly mention the crowds, the editorial inclusion of the crowds immediately after these summaries (4.25; 9:36; cf. 11:6) suggests that the ὄχλοι are to be closely associated with these aspects of Jesus' ministry.[5] This association is hardly unexpected since, apart from individual suppliants, the crowds are the main beneficiaries of Jesus' largesse.

Because these particular components of Jesus' ministry have been frequently discussed, the following overview will be cursory, and confine itself to the keywords of Matthew's editorial summaries—preaching, teaching, and healing as they apply to the crowds. It will close with a brief discussion of the miraculous feedings of the crowds.

C *κηρύσσω*

Apart from the above summaries (4:23; 9:35; 11:1), Jesus' preaching is only mentioned at the inception of his ministry (4:17 // John the Baptist 3:1-2 and the disciples 10:7,27; 24:14; 26:13).[6] In Matthew, the Baptist's message has been assimilated to that of Jesus so that each proclaims an identical *kerygma*: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (3:2 // 4:17; 10:7). Jesus' proclamation here is considerably attenuated when compared with its counterpart in Mark, and at 11:1 the content of the proclamation not stated explicitly: "Jesus went on from there to teach and preach in their cities."

The purport of the *kerygma* is to signal the advent of the eschatological activity of God—it confronts its hearers and demands

---

[3] Frank J. Matera, (*New Testament Christology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999] 32) notes that these three activities "characterize Jesus' messianic ministry to Israel."

[4] Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 355; cf. Allen, *Matthew*, liii; Birger Gerhardsson, *The Mighty Acts of Jesus According to Matthew* (Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis 1978-79; Lund: CSK, Gleerup, 1979) 22-24.

[5] Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 356.

[6] For detailed examinations of κηρύσσω, see Helmut Flender, "Lehren und Verkundigung in den synoptischen Evangelien," *EvT* 25 (1965) 704-6; Gerhard Friedrich, "κηρῦξ" *TDNT* III 683-718; Ferdinand Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1965) 121-24; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206-8; Otto Merk, "κηρύσσω" *EDNT* II 290; Schenk, *Sprache*, 266-68.

a response of them.[7] For this reason it could be regarded as preparatory, or as Guelich aptly terms it, as "heralding" the activity of God in the person of Jesus.[8] Its preparatory quality would explain why κηρύσσω is used to characterize the Baptist's activity, and why, after 11:1, it is no longer used of Jesus.[9] In Matthew, preaching is simply not so programmatic an activity for Jesus as it is in Mark; instead, teaching and healing have been accorded more emphasis. Once Jesus' proclamation has established within its auditors the need for change, his healing and teaching provide them with both the possibility of and the guidelines for effecting this change.

As Jesus' preaching in Matthew is by its very nature an activity addressed to everyone, the crowds are included in a general sense among his audience. Their inclusion is made evident by the editorial remarks at 4:23 and 4:25. At 4:23 (cf. 9:36) Jesus goes about "all Galilee," while 4:25 describes the crowds as following him ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως κτλ. The obvious inference is that the crowds were recipients of the activity described in 4:23. That they never expressly respond to Jesus' preaching is a feature Matthew has in common with Mark, but makes sense given the preliminary quality of preaching. Matthew does describe "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region about the Jordan" (3:5-6) going out to John the Baptist to confess their sins and be baptized, but John later acknowledges the preliminary character of his ministry compared to the one who is coming after him (3:11-12). The inbreaking of the kingdom becomes instantiated more fully through Jesus' teaching and healing.

D *διδάσκω*

Teaching is the next element of the editorial triad,[10] and it delineates

---

[7] Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 263.

[8] Guelich, *Sermon*, 45.

[9] It may also explain why Matthew has omitted Jesus' adjuration at Mark 1:38, "Let us go on to the next towns, that I may preach there also; for that is why I came out."

[10] For thorough discussions of teaching (διδάσκω) in Matthew, see: Bornkamm, *Tradition*, 38#1; Jacques Dupont, "Le Point de Vue de Matthieu dans le chapitre des paraboles" in Didier, *L'Evangile*, 250-59; Flender, "Lehren," 704-6; Guelich, *Sermon*, 43-44; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 28-29; *idem*, *Story*, 62-8; Joachim Lange, *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973) 316-19; Friedrich Normann, *Christos Didaskalos: Die Vorstellung von Christus als Lehrer in der christlichen Literatur des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 32; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967) 23-44; Karl H. Rengstorf, "διδάσκω κτλ" *TDNT* II 135-65; Schenk, *Sprache*, 183-4; Strecker, *Weg*, 126-28; F. Van Segbroeck, "Jésus rejeté par sa patrie," *Bib* 49 (1968) 174-77; H.-F. Weiss, "διδάσκω κτλ" *EDNT* I 317-19.

the nature and the quality of the response that is required of the one who heeds the proclamation. Since preaching and teaching are interrelated, it needs to be asked whether the two should, in fact, be distinguished.[11] Davies and Allison argue that a distinction is unnecessary, since both "have as their content the Messiah's words and deeds."[12] Strictly speaking, however, this is not always the case, as 4:3 and 4:17 demonstrate; Jesus can hardly be equated with the kingdom, even if his advent signals the kingdom's arrival. In fact, the arrival of the kingdom inaugurated by Jesus is part of the substance of "the good news of the kingdom" proclaimed at 4:23, 9:35 and 10:7.[13]

In any case, Davies and Allison likely underestimate the preparatory quality of preaching. That Matthew intends to distinguish teaching from preaching can be established from the fact that in both of the above summaries Jesus is described as teaching in synagogues. Friedrich has noted that in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus' teaching usually takes place in the synagogue, while his proclamation occurs anywhere in the open.[14] His observation holds well for Matthew. Jesus teaches in synagogues at 4:23; 9:35; 13:54 and in the temple 21:23; 22:16; 26:55. At 11:1 he teaches ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν, which may reflect an abbreviation of the two previous summaries. The one instance where teaching takes place out of doors is the Sermon on the Mount. Here, though, one might argue that its situation on a mountain brings out the parallels with Mosaic halachah. Jesus' law, like that of Moses, is presented to the people of Israel on a mountain.

Having said this, it is evident that preaching and teaching are related. Preaching summons individuals to repentance and to life, while teaching specifies the way of life.[15] This halachic tenor of διδάσκω is related to the exposition of the law,[16] or, to put it more precisely, the law is the object of teaching.[17] Teaching makes the demands of God explicit for the crowds.

---

[11] Strecker (*Weg*, 127) does recognize a distinction but contends that it is not a deep-seated one.

[12] DA I 415. See, as well, Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 80; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206-8; Graham Twelftree, *Jesus: The Miracle Worker* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999) 107.

[13] Hahn, *Mission*, 122.

[14] Friedrich, "κηρῦξ," 713, of the Synoptic Gospels.

[15] Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 208.

[16] Günther Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," *Tradition*, 38#1; Charles E. Carlston, "The Things That Defile (Mark VII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark," *NTS* 15 (1968) 83#6; Dupont, "Le point de vue," 255; Hahn, *Mission*, 121; Lange, *Erscheinen*, 316-17; Normann, *Didaskalos*, 26.

[17] Dupont, "Le point de vue," 253-54.

It is evident from their amazed responses that the crowds are often regarded as recipients of Jesus' teaching (7:28,29; 22:33). Do they continue to be its recipients over the course of Jesus' ministry? J. D. Kingsbury and several others have called this assumption into question.[18] As was mentioned in Chapter One above, Kingsbury contends that chapter 13 is the "turning point" of the gospel after which Jesus withdraws from the crowds and no longer teaches or preaches to them.[19]

Unfortunately, this contention does not hold up to detailed scrutiny. To be sure, references to Jesus' teaching are not so numerous as they are in Mark,[20] but Matthew gives his readers no reason to suppose that Jesus has ceased teaching the crowds. In the passages just mentioned, the crowds repeat almost verbatim at 22:33 the exclamation that they had made at 7:28. As Matthew has not scrupled to remove Mark's statements about the crowds elsewhere,[21] his retention of this passage would be rather unexpected if Kingsbury's surmise were correct.[22]

A quick overview of other passages will confirm that this reference to Jesus' teaching the crowds is no isolated example. At 21:23, Matthew has actually added "teaching" (διδάσκοντι) to his account.[23] That the crowds comprised at least part of the audience is evident from the leaders' manifest fear of them at 21:26: "we are afraid of the multitude." A further instance of Jesus' teaching can be seen at 22:16, where the disciples of the Herodians and Pharisees say to Jesus, "You teach the way of God in truth" (no // in Mark; cf. Luke 20:21-22). As the context and setting are the same as those at 21:26, the crowds form part of the audience here as well. Last of all, Jesus' reproach to

---

[18] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 29; Comber, "Verb," 431; Leon-Dufour, *Etudes*, 236-237; F. Van Segbroeck, "Le scandale de l'incroyance: la signification de Mt 13:35," *ETL* 41 (1965) 272. For a dissenting voice, cf. Jones, *Matthean Parables*, 286-7. Kingsbury is refuted in some detail here because his views have proved to be influential.

[19] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 29.

[20] On Matthew's changes to Mark, see Lange, *Erscheinen*, 316-317.

[21] Cf. Mark 12:37b and Mark 7:37 (though the latter is not explicitly said of the crowds) and the references to the crowd following Jesus in the account of Jairus' daughter—Mark 5:24,27,30,31.

[22] Kingsbury's (*Parables,* 29) explanation that the word's inclusion at 22:33 "merely demonstrates that Jesus had the last word over his opponents" fails to address the issue.

[23] This reference to Jesus teaching is not found in Mark (Mark 11:27) or paralleled at Luke 20:1. The absence of διδάσκοντι in a few authorities (7 it sy$^{s.c.}$ Or ^{pt}) has led Van Segbroeck ("Patrie," 175#4) to account for it as a harmonization of Luke 20:1. His conjecture, however, overlooks, in Dupont's words, "le témoignage quasi unanime de la tradition textuelle" ("Le point de vue," 253#76).

the crowds who have come to arrest him likewise suggests that they have continued to figure as the recipients of his *didachê*: "Day after day I sat in the temple teaching, and you did not seize me" (26:55). Matthew's sequence follows that of Mark 14:49 closely except that Jesus simply speaks "to them" (αὐτοῖς) in Mark, while Jesus speaks expressly "to the crowds" (εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις) in Matthew. These passages demonstrate, therefore, that Matthew regards Jesus' teaching of the crowds as a feature of his entire public ministry.[24]

To his credit, Kingsbury has not overlooked the force of such objections. He contends that:

> even though the word [sc. διδάσκω] itself occurs in several instances where Jesus is engaged in discussion with Jews, it is never used positively in the sense that Matthew provides us with an elaboration of the message of Jesus (cf. 5:2; 7:28f.), nor does it ever appear in a situation where the Jews seem receptive to him. On the contrary, this term either finds its place in the scenic framework of a pericope (13:54, 21:23, 22:16, 26:55), or is employed negatively in a denunciation of Jewish doctrine (15:9; cf. 16:12), or occurs where there is debate with Jews who are manifestly obdurate already (13:54, 22:16).[25]

Yet, his points above are far from convincing. Contrary to Kingsbury's first argument, Matthew does appear to provide at least several instances of an "elaboration of the message of Jesus." At 22:33, the crowds are described as being astonished at Jesus' teaching (καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ) when they hear Jesus' reply to the Sadducees' question about the resurrection. The implication is that Jesus' reply to the Sadducees is to be construed as an instance of his teaching. The same inference can be made about Jesus' reply to the Herodians, since their blandishment, "you…teach the way of God accurately" (22:16), implies that his answer will be an instance of such teaching. Thus, it is not accurate to say that there is no further instance of the elaboration of Jesus' teaching after the Sermon on the Mount.[26]

Kingsbury's second argument, rather unexpectedly, undercuts his own position since he concedes that Jesus does actually continue to teach "Israel." By appealing to the obdurate reception of Jesus'

---

[24] Cf. Meier, *Law*, 28#9: "Jesus is presented as *teaching* from the very beginning to the very end of his public ministry" (italics his); cf. Keegan, "Formulae," 419.

[25] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 29. The methodological problem implicit in designating the crowds as "the Jews" has already been addressed above in Chapter One.

[26] Even if these instances were not present, why would Matthew need to provide yet another example of Jesus' teaching after the extensive one that he has already furnished in the three chapters of the Sermon on the Mount?

message on the part of "the Jews," Kingsbury assumes that it is they who turn away from Jesus and his teaching, and not Jesus who turns away from them. Yet, to say that people are unprepared to accept someone's teaching is obviously very different from claiming that the teaching did not take place. It may be, however, that Kingsbury is positing a gradual or limited turning away from the crowds on Jesus' part, one corresponding to the other occasions in the gospel where Jesus withdraws his power or person from a given situation. Characteristic instances would include Jesus' failure to perform many miracles in Nazareth "because of their unbelief" (13:58), and his frequent physical withdrawals (4:12; 12:15; 14:13; 15:21).

The Nazareth episode, especially, affords a fitting paradigm. The obduracy of Jesus' townsmen serves as the explanation for Jesus' withdrawal of his miraculous power. In the gospel of Luke, the events at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) become paradigmatic for the entire gospel. Its situation at the outset of Jesus' public ministry and its extensive elaboration by Luke give it a programmatic impress: it prefigures Jesus' entire ministry to his people. As Brawley observes, "the rejection in Nazareth eventuates in its extension to other Jews."[27] Given, then, the similarity of the Nazareth episode to Kingsbury's "turning point" theory, might not the episode be taken as equally paradigmatic for Matthew?

Doubtless, it is possible but it is not likely. In Matthew, the Nazareth pericope has none of the prominence it has in Luke. In the first gospel, the Nazarenes' rejection of Jesus simply continues a theme already much in evidence in chapter 11, where Jesus upbraids Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida for their rejection of him. It becomes difficult, therefore, to see why, within the framework of Matthew's gospel, Nazareth should exemplify a "turning point," when some rejection of Jesus has already been established well before chapter 13.

Lastly, what does Kingsbury mean by "scenic framework of a pericope"? Are not 5:2 and 7:28, for instance, equally scenic? The questionable nature of Kingsbury's selection procedure emerges when one realizes that, to support his argument, he has to discount virtually half of the references to Jesus' teaching in Matthew.[28]

---

[27] Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 11.

[28] Kingsbury allows 4:23; 5:2; 7:28-29; 9:35; 11:1 and discounts 13:54; 21:23; 22:16; 22:33; 26:55. See, in addition, the criticisms tendered by Dupont, "Le point de vue," 255-256#82.

Rather than subscribe to such a Procrustean method, one does better to recognize that Matthew has chosen to emphasize Jesus' teaching at different points in his gospel. Jesus challenges the crowds with the demands of the law, not just for a part of his ministry, but for all of it.[29] Such an approach intimates that the crowds are capable, when confronted with the moment of crisis, of choosing to adhere to Jesus' *didachê*. A similar impression is afforded by Matthew's inclusion of the crowds as part of the audience of the Sermon on the Mount.[30] While the Jewish leaders are also, at various points, depicted as auditors of Jesus' teaching (21:23; 22:16; 22:33 with 22:23), the fact that they are not present for the Sermon on the Mount is suggestive.[31] It means that Jesus treats the crowds here in exactly the same manner in which he treats his disciples, since this is the only instance where he explicitly teaches the disciples.

Of course, there is an underlying element of tragedy to this aspect of Jesus' ministry to the crowds. He continues to teach them, but it seems they do not learn. Jesus' triste remarks to the crowds at 26:55 are highly evocative: "day after day I sat in the temple teaching, and you did not seize me." By the same token, the amazement of the Pharisees when confronted with Jesus' teaching (22:22) does not seem far removed from the astonishment of the crowds at 22:33. And the very fact that the crowds' astonishment at 22:33 is largely the same as 7:28 indicates that if Jesus' teaching ministry to the crowds remained constant, so too did their response. Nevertheless, the crowds figure as the recipients of Jesus' teaching throughout the public ministry and there is an underlying presumption that they are capable of appropriating it.

E *θεραπεύω*

The third verb characteristic of the summaries, θεραπεύω, also plays a significant role in the ministry of Jesus in the first gospel,[32] being found more frequently in Matthew than in the other Synoptic

[29] This feature naturally speaks against Kingsbury's (*Story*, 76) assertion that at 11:2-16:20, "Israel's response to his ministry is one of repudiation."

[30] Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 81.

[31] The Jewish leaders are not present for any of Jesus' discourses.

[32] On θεραπεύω, cf. Comber, "Verb," 431-34; W. Grimm, "θεραπεύω" *EDNT* II 143-144; Kingsbury, *Story*, 68-70; Schenk, *Sprache*, 293-4. On the place of healing in the first gospel, cf. J. P. Heil, "Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew," *CBQ* 41 (1979) 274-287, as well as the extensive discussion in Held, *Tradition*, esp. 259-264.

Gospels.[33] Unlike the word in secular Greek, θεραπεύω has no connotations of service as such, but always refers to healing, as is indicated by its frequent association with νόσος and μαλακία and other related expressions (4:23; 9:35; 10:1; cf. 8:17). Exorcism is not distinguished from healing as such, but comprises one of its constitutive elements (cf. 4:24).

Jesus' healing, like his feeding of the crowds, is often associated with Matthew's use of σπλαγχνίζομαι.[34] At 14:14, Jesus' compassion leads to his healing of the crowds. Additionally, at 9:36, it impels him to commission the disciples so that they, too, can requite the needs of the crowds.[35]

As this suggests, θεραπεύω tends to be more directly associated with the crowds than either κηρύσσω or διδάσκω. While Jesus is described as healing individuals four times,[36] he heals the crowds some eight times, and many of these instances are editorial.[37] Significantly, Matthew twice replaces Mark's references to Jesus teaching the crowds with descriptions of him healing the crowds. At Mark 6:24 the

---

33 The distribution of θεραπεύω in the Synoptic Gospels is: Matt 16 Mark 5 Luke 14. The verb ἰάομαι occurs less frequently in Matthew. Apart from the *Reflexionszitat* at 13:15, it occurs three times in the passive (8:8,13; 15:28) to indicate that an individual was (or would be) healed. Schenk (*Sprache*, 294) observes that Matthew appears to be making a deliberate distinction between ἰάομαι and θεραπεύω here, because, apart from the *Reflexionszitat* at 13:15, the other references to ἰάομαι are only applied to the healing of Gentiles (8:8 is probably derived from Q, while 8:13 and 15:28 are without parallel).

34 On σπλαγχνίζομαι, see: H. Koester "σπλάγχνον" *TDNT* VII 548-549; N. Walter "σπλάγχνον" *EDNT* III 265-66 and *idem*, "σπλαγχνίζομαι" *EDNT* III 265; Schenk, *Sprache*, 236-37. The verb occurs in Matthew at 9:36; 14:14 (// Mark 6:34); 15:32 (// Mark 3:2); 18:27; 20:34.

35 At 20:34 σπλαγχνίζομαι is used of Jesus' healing of the two blind men (20:29-34), while at 15:32 his compassion leads to his feeding of the crowds. The word also occurs in the parable of the Unforgiving Servant (18:37).

36 8:8; 12:20; 12:22; 17:18.

37 These eight instances include the summaries at 4:23 and 9:35.
4:23 θεραπεύω has been added.
4:24 no // (cf. Luke 6:18)
8:16 // Mark 1:34; Luke 4:40
9:35 θεραπεύω added
12:15 // Mark 3:10; Luke 6:18
14:14 no Mark // cf. Luke 9:11
15:30 no //, being an expansion of Mark's account of the healing of the deaf mute (Mark 7:31-37)
19:2 no //
Of individuals: 8:7 no //
12:10 // Mark 3:2; Luke 6:7
12:22 θεραπεύω added, cf. Luke 11:14
17:18 θεραπεύω added cf. Luke 9:42.

compassion of Jesus impels him to teach the crowd, whereas in Matthew it induces him to heal their sick. Again, in the pericope of the departure to Judea, Matthew changes Mark's "and he taught them again as he was accustomed" (Mark 10:1) to "and he healed them there" (19:2).

The alteration has been explained as Matthew's desire to downplay the overabundant use of διδάσκω in Mark,[38] but it is more likely an indication of Matthew's tendency to emphasize Jesus' healing ministry to the crowds. The assumption seems all the more probable when it is recognized that Matthew has fashioned a healing summary at 15:29-31,[39] which is clearly reminiscent of the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus again climbs a mountain and sits down, but this time it is the crowds and not the disciples who come, and they bring their sick with them. Like the Sermon on the Mount, it concludes with amazement on the part of the crowds (15:31 cf. 7:28), and, more significantly, with their praise of the God of Israel.

In spite of the above changes, Strecker and others contend that teaching assumes primacy over healing in Matthew.[40] Strecker affirms that "although Jesus' wonder-working is explicitly emphasized… it receives no real weight [*Eigengewicht*],"[41] and he justifies his position by appealing to several features of the gospel. He claims, for instance, that 7:22-23 shows that "mighty works" are simply *anomia* unless they are performed in righteousness.[42] Further, Jesus' own thaumaturgy in Matthew is not concerned so much with miracles themselves as with the paranesis that can be educed from them. Finally, the subordination of deeds to words in Matthew is ultimately established by Jesus' eschewing of the manipulative techniques of the wonderworker in favour of miracles accomplished with a "word."[43]

---

[38] Lange (*Erscheinen*, 317) attributes it to Matthew's desire to neutralize Mark's "inflationistischen, theologisch unerheblichen Gebrauch von διδάσκειν."

[39] Matthew omits Mark's healing of the deaf-mute (Mark 7:21-27), perhaps because of its 'magical' features, qualities generally downplayed by Matthew, or because of its similarity to 9:32-34 (cf. Donaldson, *Mountain*, 260#30). In any case, Fenton (*St. Matthew*, 257) is probably correct that Mark's use of the uncommon μογιλάλον (Mark 7:32) recalled Isa 35:5-6 to Matthew and led him to fashion a healing summary based upon it.

[40] Strecker, *Weg*, 175-177; cf. Hare, *Matthew*, 31; Hans Hübner, *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition* (2. Auf.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986) 200-201; J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of Matthean Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 126-28.

[41] Strecker (*Weg*, 176) argues: "Obwohl das Wunderwirken Jesu ausdrücklich hervorgehoben wird . . . erhält es kein Eigengewicht."

[42] Strecker, *Weg*, 176.

[43] Strecker, *Weg*, 176-7.

None of these arguments, however, is particularly weighty (to use Strecker's term), at least within the context of Jesus' ministry. Surely, Strecker does not doubt that Jesus' miracles are performed in righteousness. That they are accomplished by Jesus' fiat makes them no less miraculous. Even if paranesis does underlie some of the miracles, it by no means underlies all of them, nor does it explain why Matthew has chosen to emphasize healing, particularly in editorial summaries, where it is very difficult to find any subtext whatsoever. Theissen's remarks provide a balanced corrective to Strecker: "Nor [in Matthew] is there any sign of a general subordination of miracle to word. The programmatic miracle summary in 4:23-25 precedes the Sermon on the Mount. In it teaching and healing are linked. What Matthew has joined, let not the exegete put asunder."[44]

Further, one cannot not help but wonder whether Strecker has not posited a false dichotomy here. When he suggests that miracle working has no "*Eigengewicht*," the question naturally arises, "*Eigengewicht*" for whom? For the disciples? For the crowds? For the reader? Strecker seems oblivious to the question of audience here, but that is ultimately the decisive issue. As far as the disciples (and church) are concerned, Strecker is quite right—teaching would assuredly assume primacy. For the crowds, however, healing appears more weighty.

Such an understanding helps to explain the magnitude and scope of Matthew's editorial changes. It is not Mark's putative over-use of διδάσκω that motivates Matthew's changes, but a concern to show Jesus saving his people. It is for this reason that the Sermon on the Mount is preceded by Matthean accounts of Jesus healing the crowds.[45] For the same reason, Jesus' Triumphal Entry in the company of the crowds concludes with him healing in the temple (21:14). It is this same reason again that impels Matthew to create an analogue to the Sermon on the Mount devoted exclusively to Jesus' healing ministry of the crowds.

The emphasis becomes even more pronounced when the mission charge to the disciples is taken into account. In chapter 10 they are enjoined to preach (10:7), but are given no teaching authority whatever.[46] Instead, they are instructed repeatedly to heal the people

[44] Gerd Theissen, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983) 207. Cf. Celia Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus, and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996) 43-44; Senior, *Matthew*, 60-2.

[45] Lohfink, "Bergpredigt," 272-78.

[46] But for the absence of "Repent" (Μετανοεῖτε), the kerygma of the disciples at 10:7 is identical to that of Jesus (4:17b).

of Israel. Jesus imparts his ἐξουσία (10:1), and empowers them to carry out a ministry to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." While the same event also takes place in Mark (Mark 6:7) and Luke (Luke 9:1), in Matthew it is more far reaching. In Mark the disciples are only given authority over unclean spirits, and in Luke, "power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases" (δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν Luke 9:1). In Matthew, however, the disciples have authority over unclean spirits and are charged "to heal every disease and every infirmity."[47] Matthew has stressed the healing element through the addition of μαλακίαν, and its efficacy is emphasized by the twice-iterated πᾶσαν.[48]

The healing component is repeated once more when Jesus sends them out. After charging the disciples to go only to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," and to proclaim the nearness of the kingdom (10:6-7), he gives them specific instructions about healing. They are to "heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons" (10:8a). Such an emphasis is unique to Matthew. Mark has no healing terminology at this point (cf. Mark 3:15; 6:7), and Luke has only καὶ ἰᾶσθαι [τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς] (Luke 9:2).

The emphasis here is entirely consonant with the emphases of Jesus' ministry. Indeed, the mission and ministry of the disciples appear to be constructed precisely to echo those of Jesus.[49] The correlation between Jesus and the twelve is brought out in several ways. The recipients are the same: "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10:6; 15:24). There is also a marked correlation between Jesus' healings and those he requires of his disciples. At 10:8, the disciples are charged to undertake a variety of healing tasks, none of which is expressly paralleled in either Mark or Luke.[50] Each of these tasks, however, recalls a healing performed by Jesus in the miracle sequence 8:1 - 9:34. For example, his charge to "heal the sick" (ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε) recalls 8:5-13, 8:14-16, 9:1-8, and 9:27-31, while "raise the dead" (νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε) reflects 9:18-26. His adjuration to "cleanse lepers" (λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε) echoes 8:2-4, and

[47] Matthew 10:1 reads: ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.

[48] That these are not insignificant changes can be adjudged from the place of both ἐξουσία and πᾶς in the mouth of the risen Jesus (28:18).

[49] Brown, "Matthew's Central Section," 78; Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 113-14; Held, *Tradition*, 249-50; Luz, "Disciples," 100.

[50] Luke's τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς (Luke 9:2) is textually uncertain; cf. Metzger, *Textual*, 122-23.

the command to "cast out demons" (δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε) calls to mind both 8:16 and 8:28-34.[51]

The equation between the healing ministries of Jesus and the disciples is further developed in the list of miracles at 11:2-5, which Jesus presents as evidence to the followers of John the Baptist. As Held has noted,[52] the entire section has been placed after the Mission discourse, instead of in a more natural (i.e., Lukan) sequence so that it can include the healing and kerygmatic actions performed by the disciples.[53] In this way, both their actions and those of Jesus are to be construed as proof for John's followers, and as fulfilment of Isaiah 35:5-6 and 61:1. The mission that Jesus imparts to his disciples, then, is largely a reflection of his own. Like his ministry, theirs is directed at the lost sheep of Israel, and its chief constituent is healing.

Intriguingly, this therapeutic emphasis is the most characteristic feature of the exclusive ministry to Israel. When the Canaanite woman comes to him for healing for her daughter, Jesus' reply implicitly limits his therapeutic acts to Israel (15:24).[54] Jesus applies these same limits to his disciples—go only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10:6)—in marked contrast to the Great Commission, where he enjoins them to go to "all nations." Strikingly, the Great Commission says nothing whatever about healing, even if, for the first time, the disciples are empowered to teach (28:20). They are not commissioned to engage in any form of therapeutic ministry. Hence, the focus of the two missions is very different. The thrust of Jesus' ministry for Israel is on the healing of his people. He preaches and teaches as well, of course, but healing assumes a suggestive primacy.

The emphasis on healing is also reflected in the crowds' response in several ways. For one thing, the nature of the crowds' response to

[51] As Held (*Tradition,* 250) observes, the only task that Jesus performed that is not replicated here is the healing of the blind at 9:27-31. As Luz ("Disciples," 120#17) has shown, Matthew's additions to the miracle sequence are designed to relate to 10:1,8 and 11:5. See, further, Eduard Schweizer, "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew," *NTS* 16 (1970) 219-20, and *idem*, *Gemeinde*, 20-21.

[52] Held, *Tradition*, 252, cf. S. Freyne, *The Twelve: Disciples and Apostles. A Study in the Theology of the First Three Gospels* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968) 171.

[53] This list of miracles is from Q (Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 52) and can be said to follow a more natural sequence in Luke (Luke 7:18-22), since it is placed right after the healing of the centurion's servant (Luke 7:1-10 // Matt 8:5-13) and the raising of the widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11-17). On the mimetic quality of the disciples' ministry, see Allison, "Biographical Impulse," 1217.

[54] That Jesus does eventually heal her daughter can be attributed, like the healing of the Centurion's servant, to the supplicant's exceptional faith (15:28; cf. 8:10).

healings is different from their response to teaching. It was noted above that Matthew describes the crowds' response to Jesus' teaching twice with a nearly identical phrase: οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο [οἱ ὄχλοι 7:28] ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ (22:33). In the case of healings, however, he twice gives the crowds' utterances in direct speech (9:32-34; 12:22-24), a feature that makes the responses more vivid.[55] Yet even those responses not recorded in direct speech appear more vigorous simply because they are more varied. As will be demonstrated more fully below in the next chapter, there is also a change on the part of the crowds, in the form of an increasing christological awareness; a movement from the deeds to the doer of the deeds. It is certainly significant that it is healing which provokes this response in the crowds, and not Jesus' teaching.

Why should the healing of the crowds receive such emphasis? The most likely answer is that Matthew and his community perceived in Jesus' healings the arrival of the kingdom—the advent of the Messiah. Yet, whether these healings would of themselves have suggested the arrival of the Messiah is disputed. Twelftree has recently concluded that it cannot be maintained that exorcisms would have suggested a messianic origin for Jesus.[56] E. P. Sanders makes similar claims about miracles in general: "there is nothing about miracles which would trigger, in the first-century Jewish world, the expectation that the end was at hand."[57] Yet, A. E. Harvey protests with some justice, that the kind of cures described in 15:31 "were not merely unprecedented; they were characteristic of the new age which...was expected one way or another by the majority of the contemporaries of Jesus."[58] That

---

[55] In Mark, by contrast, there is a response to Jesus' teaching given in *oratio recta*: "What is this? A new teaching! With authority he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him" (Mark 1:27).

[56] Graham Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993) 215.

[57] E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985) 170; for his discussion of exorcisms, cf. 134-41. See, as well, I. Broer, "Versuch zur Christologie des ersten Evangeliums" in F. Van Segbroeck et al. *The Four Gospels*, 1261.

[58] A. E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982) 115. The question broaches the increasingly vexed problem of messianic expectation. See the standard discussions by G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the first Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927) II 323-76; *HJP* II 492-547; Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5. Auf.; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1965) IV.2 857-80, and, as a response to Schürer, W. S. Green, "Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question" in J. Neusner et al., *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987) 1-13.

Matthew has the new age in view is strongly suggested by the allusions to Isaiah 35:5-6, which underlie both Jesus' answer to John the Baptist, and Matthew's healing summary at 15:29-31.[59]

Substantial corroboration for this view is provided by the Qumran fragment 4Q521. This passage appears to associate the Messiah with a period when God (or his Messiah?) will actively intervene in human affairs:

> "…heaven and earth will obey his messiah…
> For the Lord will seek out the pious and call the righteous by name, and his spirit will hover over the poor and he will renew the faithful by his might. For he will glorify the pious on the throne of an eternal kingdom, releasing captives, giving sight to the blind and raising up those who are bo[wed down]….The fr[uit of a] good [wor]k will not be delayed for anyone and the glorious things that have not taken place the Lord will do as he s[aid] for he will heal the wounded, give life to the dead and preach good news to the poor and he will [sat]isfy the [weak] ones and lead those who have been cast out and enrich the hungry…."[60]

John Collins notes that much of the imagery is derived from Psalm 146, with the notable exception of the mention of the Messiah.[61] While the fragmentary nature of the text makes certainty impossible, it does appear as if healing and the raising of the dead are associated with the time of the Messiah.[62] Even if Abegg has urged caution in evaluating the messianic character of this passage,[63] its remarkable similarity to Matthew 11:2-5 (=Luke 7:22) suggests that there were some traditions within Judaism that did associate miracles—particularly healings—with the inbreaking of the messianic age.[64]

This connection is further suggested by the programmatic statement at Matthew 1:21—"for he will save his people from their

---

[59] H. C. Kee, *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times* (SNTSMS 55; Cambridge: University Press, 1986) 79. Cf. Isa 29:18-19; 61:1.

[60] Quoted from John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) 117.

[61] Collins, *Scepter*, 117.

[62] John Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994) 110; Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 170.

[63] Martin G. Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 142-43.

[64] Martínez and Barrera, *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 169. Given that references to resurrection are exceptional in the Qumran literature, Collins suggests that 4Q521 may not be sectarian. He even entertains the possibility that the author of Q was acquainted with 4Q521 (*Scepter*, 122).

sins" (Cf. Ps 130:8).[65] Even if this passage does not expressly mention healing, the pericope of the healing of the paralytic (9:1-8) demonstrates that the forgiveness of sins is closely allied with healing.[66] Foerster has remarked that "the remission of sins is not a central theme of the Messianic salvation or deliverance,"[67] but there are, nevertheless, indications in the *Targum of Isaiah* that forgiveness did come to be associated with the Messiah, the Servant of the Lord, even if the Messiah was merely an intercessor who did not himself forgive.[68] The targumic reformulation of Isaiah 53:4 is particularly striking: "*Then he will beseech concerning our sins* and *our iniquities for his sake will be forgiven;* yet we *were* esteem*ed wounded,* smitten *before the LORD* and afflicted." The intercessory aspect of the entire chapter is marked, though it is apparent that the Messiah is not a suffering servant figure.[69]

Naturally, the dating of the levels of tradition within the Targum is problematic, but Chilton posits a time frame of ca. 70-135.[70] He contends that, for the meturgeman writing after the disaster in 70, "the gospel of Jesus was not yet of sufficient concern to make him alter his interpretation for apologetic reasons, and it is permissible to infer that, in his messianic understanding of the Isaian servant, the meturgeman attests a primitive exegesis common to Judaism and Christianity."[71] If Chilton's inference is permissible, then the forgive-

---

[65] Hans Walter Wolff (*Jesaja im Urchristentum* [4. Auf.; Giessen: Brunnen, 1984] 74) relates the *Reflexionszitat* at 8:17 to 1:21: "die Heilungen folgen aus seinem Knechtsdienst, in dem er mit der Macht der Sünde und des Todes ringt" (original italicized).

[66] It should also be remarked that σώζω can mean "free from disease" especially in the passive: cf. BAGD 1c and Matt 9:21 // Mark 5:28; Matt 9:22a // Mark 5:34a; Matt 9:22b no //. For the link between sin and sickness, see: John 9:1-3; Pss 32:3-5; 103:2-3; 1 Enoch 95:4; Sir 38:9-11,15; 1Q GA 20:12-29; 4Q OrNab. See, as well, bNed. 41a: "A sick man does not recover from his sickness until all his sins are forgiven him," and bMeg. 17b: "redemption and healing come after forgiveness." Cf. the discussion in Kee, *Medicine,* 19-20, 24-26, 72.

[67] W. Foerster *et al.*, "σώζω κτλ" *TDNT* VII 991.

[68] The passages cited above allude to the Messiah mentioned at 52:13: "Behold, my servant, *the Messiah* shall prosper...." The translations of the Targum given here are from Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (The Aramaic Bible 11; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987). The italics represent the "innovative wording" of the Targum, the roman type, the rendering of the Hebrew.

[69] K. Koch ("Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53–Targum. Beitrag zu der Praxis der aramäischen Bibelübersetzung,"*Journal for the Study of Judaism* 3 (1972) 147) opines that "Von allen Taten des Messias wird am nachdrücklichsten sein Wirken zur *Sündenvergebung* herausgestellt (his italics)."

[70] Bruce D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSup 23; Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) 95.

[71] Chilton, *Glory*, 94.

ness of sins may well have come to be associated with the inbreaking of the messianic age and representative of eschatological blessing.

In any case, Matthew likely understands Jesus' therapeutic ministry to the crowds as the outworking of 1:21. As was shown in the previous chapter, the phrase "his people" (τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ) at 1:21 is best taken as a reference to Israel. Matthew demonstrates through the crowds' responses not only that Jesus' ministry was confined to Israel, but also that scripture (Ps 130:8; Is 53:4) had found its fulfilment in his ministry. The crowds function, therefore, as the fortunate recipients of the Messiah's promised visitation to his people. They cannot help but recognize in him, and particularly in his healing, something otherwise unprecedented, namely, the advent of God's promised eschatological blessings.

F *Feeding*

In addition to the programmatic deeds of Jesus outlined in the editorial summaries, Jesus is twice described as feeding the crowds. The two feeding episodes, in fact, account for over a fifth of the references to the crowds in the gospel (14:13,14,15,19,22,23;15:32,33, 35,36,39).[72] That Matthew has almost double Mark's number is, in part, attributable to his tendency to identify the actors in his gospel.[73] Yet, it is not unlikely that it has additional significance. As was just demonstrated with respect to healing, Matthew tends to emphasize Jesus' care, not simply for the spiritual needs of the crowds, but also for their physical well-being. The fact that the second feeding narrative (15:32-39) has actually been appended to the editorial healing summary at 15:29-31 suggests how closely the two are allied.[74]

Theissen classifies the multiplication of the loaves under the rubric "gift miracles," which are distinguished from other miracles, such as healings, in being unsought. Such miracles provide an abundance of material goods entirely at the initiative of the miracle-worker.[75] They also differ from other miracle stories in lacking their central motifs, and for this reason, there is no acclamation or wonderment on the

---

[72] Mark, in contrast to the 11 references in Matthew, has only six: Mark 6:34, 45; 8:1,2,6*bis*.

[73] E. P. Sanders, *Tendencies*, 183.

[74] In Mark the second feeding is preceded by the healing of a deaf and dumb man (Mark 7:31-37), which, as was just noted, Matthew has not included in his gospel. The two pericopae in Mark are also separated by the indefinite temporal indicator "in those days" (Mark 8:1).

[75] Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 103-6. Compare 1 Kings 17:8-16; 2 Kings 4:1-7; 4:42-4 and John 2:1-11 (which does, however, include a request at John 2:3-4).

part of the crowds at what transpires, even though gift miracles are intrinsically more noteworthy.[76]

As the feeding of the crowds is common to all four canonical gospels (Matt 14:13-21; 15:32-39; Mark 6:32-44; [7:31-37;] 8:1-9 Luke 9:10-17; John 6:1-15), some have detected a common underlying source.[77] On balance, however, the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke can be explained adequately without recourse to the supposition of an additional source.[78] Both of Matthew's accounts simplify and abbreviate the versions given in Mark. The two miraculous feedings have been assimilated to each other and have been recast in order to emphasize the involvement of the disciples.[79] The disciples become joint-givers with Jesus and act as ministrants to the crowds. He gives the bread to them and they, in turn, distribute it to the multitudes.

In the feeding of the five thousand, Matthew differs from Mark in having Jesus' compassion result in the act of healing instead of teaching.[80] In the feeding of the four thousand, Matthew omits the healing of the deaf mute (Mark 7:32-37) and fashions instead his healing summary on a mountaintop (15:29-31). The summary retains several features of Mark's healing account, including the reaction of the multitudes. Where it differs, of course, is in its expansion of the healing narrative to include the crowds in general. Matthew begins both of his feedings, with healings of the crowds, and the feeding narratives suggest, as a consequence, that healing is again Jesus' primary mandate. Strikingly, teaching does not even figure in either of Matthew's feedings.

As with Jesus' healings, his feedings of the crowds are expressive of eschatological blessings, and, in particular, an anticipation of the messianic banquet at the end of days. While some of the more characteristic features of the banquet, such as the themes of

---

[76] Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 103. For a catalogue of typical motifs, cf. 47-72. Theissen's taxonomy explains the absence of the crowds' acclamation better than Held's supposition (*Tradition*, 182) that the multiplication of the loaves was an epiphany imparted only to the disciples.

[77] Ernst Bammel, "The Feeding of the Multitude" in Bammel and Moule, *Politics*, 214-215.

[78] DA II 478-80.

[79] Held, *Tradition*, 181-87.

[80] Luke also describes Jesus as healing, but instead of having compassion on the crowds, Jesus "welcomed them and spoke to them of the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:11).

judgement and the triumph over God's enemies, are absent,[81] there are still considerable points of overlap. Most notable is the satisfaction of hunger: "those who are hungry will enjoy themselves" and eat manna (2 Bar 29:6-8) or other divinely provided sustenance (Isa 25:6; SibOr 3.620-623, 744-751; 5.282-83). Bread is not mentioned with great frequency in such accounts, but this is doubtless because it pales next to more divine fare such as manna, "the bread of the angels."[82] The Community Rule at Qumran speaks of bread and wine (1 QSa 2:17-20), but this is probably because the meal described is a regular community meal anticipating the coming messianic banquet.[83]

Not unexpectedly, communion with the Messiah is also a typical feature of the messianic banquet (1 QSa 2:11-22; 2 Bar 29:3; 1 Enoch 62:12-14), and the narratives may also point back to Israel's time in the wilderness, where God miraculously provided them with manna.[84] In fact, Allison argues convincingly that, in Matthew, the feeding narratives simultaneously evoke the past, present and future in the form of the provision of manna, the Eucharist and the messianic banquet.[85] Jesus, therefore, recapitulates the career of Moses in feeding his people in the wilderness, but also anticipates the final gathering of all nations on Zion.[86] The important feature is that the Messiah is with his people, providing for their every need. The Pharisees and other Jewish leaders are notably absent. This time in the wilderness, therefore, represents a messianic idyll. The people of Israel are with their Messiah, and, for the time being, all their woes are taken away. It is no wonder that they glorify God (15:31).

---

[81] See 1 Enoch 62:12-16 and J. Priest, "A Note on the Messianic Banquet" in J. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 234-37; Dennis E. Smith, "The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered" in Birger Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 64-73, and *idem*, "Messianic Banquet," *ABD* IV 789.

[82] Ps 78:25; Wis 16:20; 4 Ezra 1:19; cf. JosAsen 16:16.

[83] L. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 58-67; Priest, "Note on the Messianic Banquet," 228-29.

[84] Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 238-42.

[85] Allison, *The New Moses*, 242.

[86] Donaldson (*Mountain*, 128-35) has especially stressed this theme, and recognized that the mountain scene at 15:29-39, in which Jesus cares for Israel, anticipates the mountain scene at the end of the gospel, where the mission is extended to all nations.

G *Jesus' Shepherding of the Sheep*

Given the identification of the crowds as sheep made above in Chapter Four, it hardly surprises that Jesus' care for the crowds is reminiscent of the care of a shepherd for his flock.[87] Such is the case, for instance, with his preaching and teaching. Both provide the crowds with guidance and enable them to appropriate Jesus' halachah and learn how they ought to conduct themselves.[88] H. D. Betz has argued that Jesus' teaching, as exemplified by the Sermon on the Mount, is "theology to be intellectually appropriated and internalized…and implemented in concrete situations of life."[89] If so, his conception fits admirably with the situation of the crowds.

Jesus' healing has more obvious parallels with the shepherding metaphor. As the good shepherd, Jesus carries out the same office as that promised by God in Ezekiel 34:11-16. He has healed the sick (8:2-4,16), strengthened the weak (8:16-17), bound up the crippled (8:5-13; 9:1-8), sought the lost (9:10-13) and brought back the strayed (9:9). Jesus not only demonstrates his compassion and widespread concern (9:35), he cares for the flock by summoning disciples to do precisely what he has already done in chapters 8 and 9. Ezekiel complains that there was "none to search or seek for" the sheep (Ezek 34:6). Jesus' commissioning of the disciples rectifies this problem.

Of course, the association between Matthew and Ezekiel 34 may not be so strong as the above argument would suppose. Nevertheless, there is evidence to suggest that Ezekiel's metaphor of the sheep was an established topos in intertestamental literature. The fifth fragment of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel recurs to the motif, and gives especial prominence to the therapeutic aspect of the shepherd. Some of the text is cited in Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus* 1:9, and this version has been used to restore a longer fragment from one of the Chester Beatty papyri. Part of the restored text runs:

> [the lam]e I will bind up, and that which is troub[led]
> [I wi]ll heal, and that which is led as[tray I will]
> [return, a]nd I will feed th[em and give them]
> [rest o]n my holy mountain, [and I]
> [will be] a shepherd to them, a[nd I will be near]

---

[87] Heil ("Shepherd and Sheep," 699-708) emerges with findings similar to those presented in this section.

[88] For an explicit connection between tending a flock and teaching, see Sir 18:13—the Lord "rebukes and trains and teaches them, and turns them back, as a shepherd his flock." Cf., further, R. H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 323.

[89] H. D. Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 16.

[to them as the ga]rment to [their] sk[in] [90]

Because the Apocryphon is apparently cited by Clement of Rome (1 Clement 8:3), it was likely written sometime before the 80s CE, and, perhaps, as early as 250 BCE.[91] While there is no direct evidence to show that Matthew was acquainted with the work, the passage does, nevertheless, demonstrate that he was not alone in his elaboration of a "therapeutic shepherd."

Jesus also feeds the crowds as a shepherd his sheep. In Mark, the "sheep without a shepherd" logion provides the grounds for Jesus' compassion. As was seen earlier, Matthew has resituated it at 9:36 to serve as the rationale for the commissioning of the disciples, and he does not repeat it in the feeding accounts. Its absence might suggest that there is no underlying pastoral imagery, particularly of the kind evoked by Ezekiel 34, which is often thought to underlie the Marcan context.[92] Yet Bammel is likely correct in detecting it in the Matthean feeding accounts as well.[93] Notable, for instance, is Matthew's situation of the feeding of the four thousand on a mountain (15:29). The mountain is only to be found in Matthew's version of the feeding; it is absent in Mark. Yet the account in Ezekiel 34 three times makes mention of it. The Lord God says "I will feed them on the mountains of Israel… I will feed them in a good pasture on a high mountain of Israel…and they shall feed in a fat pasture on the mountains of Israel" (Ezek 34:13-14). Hence, there may well be a connection here.

Yet if this motif is present, why did Matthew not repeat the substance of 9:36 at either of the feedings? In all likelihood, it is because the crowds are no longer sheep without a shepherd.[94] The

[90] Translation from James R. Mueller, *The Five Fragments of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel: A Critical Study* (JSPSup 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 152-53. Compare the above translation with his translation (158) of the passage in the *Paedagogus*: "And the lame I will bind up, and that which is troubled I will heal, and that which is led astray I will return, and I will feed them on my holy mountain...and I will be their shepherd and I will be near to them as the garment of their skin." Clement styles these as "the promises of the good shepherd" and adds "Feed us, the children as sheep, Yes, master, fill us with righteousness, your pasture; yes, teacher, shepherd us on your holy mountain, the church."

[91] This is the time frame suggested by Mueller, *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, 169-70.

[92] Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas: Word, 1989) 340-41,344; R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT; Freibourg: Herder, 1976) I 350; Walter, "σπλαγχνίζομαι," 265.

[93] Bammel, "Feeding," 219-20 *pace* DA II 487#21, who account it a "doubtful suggestion."

[94] Bammel ("Feeding," 219) remarks that "Mark, however, has the puzzling remark on the sheep without a shepherd (6:34). Surely it was the opinion of the evangelist that Jesus did not leave the multitude in this state."

crowds have been tended by Jesus, who has not merely undertaken to shepherd them himself, but has "set shepherds over them who will care for them" (Jer 23:4) in the person of his disciples. Now that the disciples have been commissioned to go to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," the crowds are no longer without shepherds to care for them. The emphasis on the disciples' involvement in the feeding miracles helps to emphasize this very point.

In all of these functions, Jesus acts as the emissary of God. Like God, he gives them their daily bread (6:11). In Ezekiel 34, it is God himself who will act on behalf of the sheep. In particular, he responds with compassion and mercy. The reason such qualities receive such emphasis in Matthew is that they are seen to epitomize God's own concern for his people. Jesus is the shepherd whom he has raised up for the sheep.

H *Conclusion*

In the above discussion of the characteristic elements of Jesus' ministry, preaching emerges as something related to, but distinct from teaching. Jesus' preaching confronts the individual with the approach of the kingdom and its demands, while his teaching makes the nature of those demands explicit. Healing and feeding are also essential components of Jesus' ministry to the crowds.

While previous studies have sought to categorize the importance of the various aspects of Jesus' ministry in absolute terms, the above analysis has shown that it is more fitting to evaluate his ministry in terms of its recipients. As far as the crowds are concerned, healing emerges as the most fundamental element of Jesus' activity amongst them. It is of more immediate concern to the crowds than either preaching or teaching, as can be adjudged from their receptive response to it. Matthew is very likely using the responses of the crowd to demonstrate that the Messiah did in fact come to heal his people and forgive their sins, as was prophesied in the Scriptures. This would further explain why no healing ministry is required of the disciples when they expand their mission to include all nations. It is an aspect of ministry reserved for Israel.

The character of Jesus' entire ministry can be used to limn a rough image of the crowds. Their chief trait is an overwhelming need. That Jesus undertakes to heal them before all else suggests that they need to be restored to a position of wholeness before they can fully appropriate the other aspects of his ministry. Healing comes before teaching and even before feeding. Obviously, Jesus' therapeutic

ministry is best suited to assuage it, but his teaching and feeding of the crowds, and even his proclamation are all calculated to remedy their deficiencies and give them the care and guidance they require. That they should be in such straits in the first place is an oblique commentary on the inadequacy of their leadership. The feeding episodes, in particular, reveal that once the crowds do appropriate the leadership and benefits provided by Jesus, they move very close indeed to the messianic age.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER SIX

A *The Response of the Crowds to Jesus*

The next chapter will focus on the crowds' reactions to Jesus. This will include a consideration of individual reactions attributed to them—ἐκπλήσσομαι, θαυμάζω, ἐξίστημι, φοβέομαι, δοξάζω—as well as the statements they make regarding Jesus and his activity.[1] It will not be necessary to discuss the background of these expressions in detail, since Matthew is entirely indebted to Mark or Q for his terminology.[2] Each one of the terms used to describe the crowds finds at least one analogue in Matthew's sources.[3]

What is without analogue in his sources is the extent to which Matthew comes to associate these terms with the ὄχλοι. With one exception, none of these terms is expressly ascribed to the ὄχλος in Mark,[4] and only once to the crowd in Q.[5] To be sure, the crowd is often the implied actor in the narrative in Mark, but Matthew makes this connection far more explicit.[6] In Matthew, Jesus acts and the crowd reacts. As was argued above, they function as the customary foil to Jesus' words and deeds.

---

[1] This analysis will exclude 21:9, 11 and 46, all of which will be treated in more detail below.

[2] For Hellenistic parallels to the terms used in Mark, see B. Blackburn, *Theios Anêr and the Markan Miracle Traditions* (WUNT 2/40; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991) 225-27. While the associations of these terms with pagan epiphanies ought not to be overlooked, Kenzo Tagawa (*Miracles et évangile*, 100) rightly emphasizes that "dans la monde de tradition juive l'étonnement et la crainte sont un motif assez géneral et qui ne relève pas exclusivement de la terminologie particulière de la théophanie."

[3] It is instructive to note that Matthew is selective and sparing in those terms that he employs. According to Timothy Dwyer (*The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark* [JSNTSup 128; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996] 20-21), Matthew uses wonder terminology 27 times (versus 32 places in Mark) and only follows Mark 11 times. Matthew has omitted all Mark's references to θαμβέομαι: Mark 1:27 // Luke 4:36 (θάμβος); Mark 10:24 (disciples); 10:32 (disciples? crowds?); ἐκθαμβέομαι Mark 9:15 cf. Matt 17:14; Mark 14:33; 16:5; ἐξεθαύμαζον 12:17. Nor does Matthew employ the words ἐκθαύμαζω (Mark 12:17), τρόμος (Mark 16:8), ἔκστασις (Mark 5:42; 16:8), or ἔκφοβος (Mark 9:6).

[4] The one exception is Mark 11:18: πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. Cf. Mark 9:15, where πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.

[5] Matthew 9:33 // Luke 11:14 relate that: καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.

[6] On the following words as typical crowd responses in healing stories, see Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition,* 225-226. Theissen (*Miracle Stories*, 69) notes that "Matthew almost always gives a specific subject" to those who were seized with amazement; cf. Dwyer, *Wonder*, 21.

Yet, if they do function as a foil to Jesus, what is suggested by their responses? Does their astonishment suggest a disciple-like faith on their part, as has sometimes been thought, or something rather less?[7] The following discussion will consider each of the words used to characterize the reactions of the ὄχλοι, and then proceed to consider the context of these reactions within the framework of the gospel. From there, it will move to a consideration of the crowds' responses in direct speech.

B *ἐκπλήσσομαι*

The word ἐκπλήσσομαι means "amazed" or "overwhelmed with wonder."[8] There are four occurrences of ἐκπλήσσομαι in Matthew versus five in Mark.[9] Generally speaking, Matthew employs the word when he describes the reactions of different groups to Jesus' teaching, a fact that may help to explain why, at 15:31 (// Mark 7:37), in a healing episode where Jesus does not teach, Matthew has omitted the word in favour of θαυμάζω. Just how closely ἐκπλήσσομαι is allied with responses to Jesus' teaching can be adjudged from the addition of ἀκούσαντες to both 19:25 and 22:33.[10] The auditors' astonishment follows immediately upon their hearing of Jesus' teaching. That this astonishment represents a preliminary reaction can be deduced from the fact that it prompts very different spoken responses on the part of the disciples (19:25) in one instance, and the inhabitants of Nazareth (13:54) in another.

The disciples express astonishment when they hear Jesus state how difficult it is for a rich man to be saved (19:25). They ask, "Who then can be saved" (19:25)?[11] Their inadequate understanding of the economy of the kingdom leads them to overvalue the rich; the very

---

[7] Minear ("Crowds," 30), for instance, has remarked that "the words used to describe their response sound highly confessional and liturgical." Minear also speaks of the crowds' "faith" and even of their "worshipping" Jesus.

[8] See the discussions of the word by H. Balz, "ἐκπλήσσομαι" *EDNT* I 420; D. H. Field, "Ecstasy, etc.," *NIDNTT* I 529-530; Richard Karpinski, *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ à la base de l'enseignement de Jésus et de la mission apostolique selon S. Matthieu* (Rome: Institut des Recherches Ecclésiastiques, 1961) 9; Schenk, *Sprache*, 185. In the NT, as in the LXX, the word is found only in the passive voice: cf. BAGD s.v. 2.

[9] Matt 7:28 // Mark 1:22 (cf. Mark 11:18); 13:54 // Mark 6:2; 19:25 // Mark 10:26; 22:33 no parallel. Cf. Mark 7:37.

[10] The aorist participial form of ἀκούω is typically Matthean; cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 641. Both Zizemer (*Verhältnis*, 45) and Van Segbroeck ("Patrie," 180) note the consistency with which Matthew allies the expression with teaching.

[11] Neither praise nor blame seem to attend their response, though Beare (*Matthew*, 397) detects a slight note of reproach in Jesus' reply.

difference of heavenly values from earthly ones provokes their astonishment. Hence, their amazement stems not from the authority of Jesus' teaching, which they implicitly recognize, but its import. They have already responded to Jesus' authority in having chosen to follow him (19:27). What they now require is an understanding of the implications of following him; their amazement is a preliminary questioning of the substance of Jesus' teaching, which, for them, goes on to develop into a deeper understanding of the divine economy.

The episode at Nazareth (13:54-58), however, turns out to be very different. Matthew has again associated astonishment with Jesus' teaching, and his close linking of the two can be seen in his transformation of Mark's "he began to teach…and many who heard him were astonished" (Mark 6:1) into a result clause: "he taught them…so that (ὥστε) they were astonished" (13:54). Their astonishment becomes the direct consequence of his teaching. It also furnishes the basis for their exclamation about Jesus' wisdom and mighty works (13:54). The Nazareans recognize a quality in Jesus' teaching—presumably his wisdom—that provokes their astonishment. Yet, it is apparent that their astonishment does not develop into any sort of faith or reverence on their part, because they go on to revile Jesus.

Grässer has argued that the Nazareans' twofold response betrays a fundamental inconsistency in the fabric of the narrative: "Here" he suggests, "there remains a crack, which we cannot get rid of either by the psychological explanation of two contrary impressions among the hearers, or by a harmonizing exegesis, by which we are taught to see ἐκπλήσσομαι and ἐσκανδαλίζοντο in the same way."[12] Nevertheless, it appears that Matthew has attempted to pave over this crack, as can be determined from his use of the question: "Where then did this man get all this?" (13:56), which establishes the crux of the problem. The people of Nazareth recognize the force of his wisdom and mighty works, but not their origin. What they think they know about Jesus leads them to disregard these qualities and reject him. Consequently, their final response to Jesus is subsequent to, and independent of, their initial amazement. For both the Nazareans and Jesus' disciples, therefore, astonishment is an immediate and preliminary reaction.

How do these responses compare with those of the crowds? The verb ἐκπλήσσομαι is used of the crowds at 7:28 and 22:33, and the

---

[12] Erich Grässer, "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI, 1-6a). Notes on the Redaction and Theology of St. Mark," *NTS* 16 (1970) 6-7.

latter instance is probably modelled on the former, and compensates for Matthew's omission of Mark 12:37b—"And the great throng heard him gladly." As was mentioned above in Chapter Three, Matthew 7:28-29 is itself based on Mark 1:22, the conclusion to the episode where Jesus teaches in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mark 1:21-22). Matthew omits Mark 1:21, and refashions it into the conclusion for the Sermon on the Mount. The passage is almost identical with Mark 1:22, except that the crowds replace Mark's impersonal plural, and "their" is added to Mark's "scribes."[13]

The crowds' reaction is appended to the first of Matthew's "terminal formulations," the editorial conclusions that mark the end of each of the five discourses in Matthew ("And when Jesus had finished these sayings..." 7:28-29; 11:1; 13:53: 19:1; 26:1). As has long been recognized, these formulations are transitional and facilitate the movement from discourse to narrative.[14] In this case, the narrative resumes with the crowds' amazement at Jesus' authoritative teaching. What, then, does their amazement suggest about their relation to Jesus?

The preposition ἐπί gives the ground for their reaction; it is on account of his teaching that they are astonished. Verse 7:29 goes on to explain that this was because of his ἐξουσία; he taught as one having authority, quite unlike the scribes. This idea likely underlies 22:33 as well. What their remark suggests, however, is that the crowds' initial response is more akin to that of the Nazareans than to the disciples. Instead of commenting on the substance of Jesus' *dicta*, they remark instead on the style of his teaching. That they are able to discern his unique authority is a point in their favour. Yet, unlike both the disciples and the inhabitants of Nazareth, they do not move beyond their initial amazement either to appropriate Jesus' teaching or to reject him. They remain static and uncommitted either way.

What the above passages suggest about ἐκπλήσσομαι, therefore, is that astonishment represents an immediate, unconsidered reaction to Jesus' teaching on the part of the hearer.[15] It could conceivably result in faith, but it might just as easily result in a rejection of faith. At best, it is a prelude.

---

[13] Both changes are typical of Matthew. For the addition of αὐτῶν, cf. 4:23; 9:35: 10:17; 11:1; 12:9; 13:54. On the omission of Mark 1:21 and Mark 1:23-28, see John M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (SBT 28; London: SCM, 1974) 137-38.

[14] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 262.

[15] Karpinski, *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ*, 9.

C *θαυμάζω*

This word θαυμάζω is used of a variety of groups and in a variety of situations in Matthew.[16] It is twice used of the crowds—at 9:33 and 15:31. In both instances, it describes their response to deeds of Jesus—his casting out of a demon (9:33) and his multiple healings (15:31). Intriguingly, it is also used of the Herodians and disciples of the Pharisees (22:22—albeit in dependence on Mark 12:17), who marvel at Jesus' reply to their trick question. Pilate also wonders at Jesus' silence before his accusers (27:14).

In addition, the disciples marvel at the withering of the fig tree—something unique to Matthew's account. Matthew has added the word to Mark's version, and, what is more, suggested that it represents an inadequate reaction on the part of the disciples. Jesus' answer (21:21)—"Truly, I say to you, if you have faith and never doubt"—could signal an inadequate doubtful response on their part. As Bertram observes, "the reply of Jesus shows that this astonishment contains an element of critical questioning, of enquiry and even of doubt."[17] Just as in the passages where they are reproached for their little faith (8:26; 16:8; 17:20 cf. 14:31), the disciples' astonishment betrays an insufficient appreciation of Jesus' identity.

These findings are highly suggestive. If, on the one hand, the Jewish leaders marvel, and on the other, it is considered a deficient reaction on the part of the disciples, the implication is clear. The reaction as such denotes no commitment or faith on the part of the beholder.[18] As with ἐκπλήσσομαι, the crowds' response is, perhaps, best regarded as a spontaneous, uncritical reaction to something that is inexplicable or overwhelming. For the crowds, however, as will become evident below, it also serves as the basis for more elaborate responses.

---

[16] θαυμάζω is found five times in Matthew: 8:10 // Luke 7:9; 8:27 // Luke 8:25 // (Mark 4:41 φοβέομαι); 9:33 // Luke 11:14; 15:31 // (Mark 7:37 ἐκπλήσσομαι); 21:20 no parallels; 22:22 // Luke 20:26 // (Mark 12:17 ἐκθαύμαζον); 27:14 // Mark 15:5. Matthew omits Mark 5:20; 6:6 and 15:4 as well as Luke 11:14 Q (for which he uses ἐξίστημι instead 12:23). At 15:31, θαυμάζω occurs with δοξάζω.

On the term, see F. Annen, "θαυμάζω" *EDNT* II 134-35; Georg Bertram, "θαῦμα κτλ" *TDNT* III 37-40; W. Mundle, "Miracle, etc.," *NIDNTT* II 620-26; Schenk, *Sprache*, 281-82; Zizemer, *Verhältnis*, 127-128.

[17] Bertram, "θαῦμα" 38; Barth, *Tradition*, 119#3; R. A. Edwards, "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples" in Fernando Segovia (ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament* (Philadephia: Fortress, 1985) 58.

[18] This is also the opinion of Mundle ("Miracle, etc.," 624)—"such amazement, of course, in no way presupposes faith, though it may well presuppose an inkling of the presence of divine authority" (Mundle is speaking of the way the word is used in the Synoptic Gospels' account of the Jewish leaders' amazement).

D *ἐξίστημι*

This verb ἐξίστημι occurs only once in Matthew, and its presence can likely be attributed to his appropriation of Mark's use of the word at Mark 3:21.[19] Matthew, however, has applied it to the crowds instead of to Jesus.[20] The expression denotes being "beside oneself" through astonishment or fear,[21] in this case, as a result of being confronted with one of Jesus' mighty acts. In essence, however, the reaction is probably very similar to that of θαυμάζω, because this pericope is a doublet of 9:32-34, where θαυμάζω is used of the crowds' reaction.[22] That it represents, once more, a preliminary reaction is borne out by the observation that Matthew does not use it of the disciples' response to Jesus in the walking on the water pericope (Matt 14:22-33; Mark 6:45-52). Where the disciples in Mark καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο· (Mark 6:51) at Jesus, in Matthew they worship (προσεκύνησαν) him and confess that he is the Son of God (14:33).[23] In Matthew, the disciples do not normally express astonishment at Jesus' words or deeds. Because they are endowed with understanding, they are able to recognize Jesus and worship him. The crowds, by contrast, never worship Jesus or confess him to be the Son of God, and amazement appears to be one of their characteristic responses.

E *Φοβέομαι*

As with the verb ἐκπλήσσομαι, φοβέομαι[24] comes into Matthew's vocabulary by way of Mark and the LXX.[25] Matthew uses it more

---

[19] The word occurs once in Matthew—12:23 // Matt 9:33 θαυμάζω // Luke 11:14 θαυμάζω. Matthew omits Mark 2:12 in favour of φοβέομαι and similarly excises it and its cognates at Mark 5:42 and Mark 6:51 (of the disciples).
On the word itself, consult: Dwyer, *Wonder,* 100; J. Lambrecht, "ἐξίστημι" *EDNT* II:7-8; W. Mundle, "Ecstasy, etc.," *NIDNTT* I 527-528, and A. Oepke, "ἔκστασις κτλ" *TDNT* II 459-460; Schenk, *Sprache,* 282.

[20] Lambrecht, "ἐξίστημι," 8.

[21] At Mark 3:21 it is used of Jesus being "beside himself."

[22] Held, *Tradition,* 247; E. Schweizer, "Observance," 213.

[23] On προσκυνέω, see John Paul Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt. 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21* (AnBib 87; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981) 66; W. G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Matthew 17:22-18:35* (AnBib 44; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970) 214-215.

[24] The verb φοβέομαι is found 18 times in Matthew. Where Matthew uses it of the crowds (with δοξάζω) 9:8, Mark has ἐξίστημι (Mark 2:12) and Luke ἔκστασις (Luke 5:26). Matthew likewise omits Mark 5:15 // Luke 8:35. Instances of φοβέομαι not expressly related to the crowds' or disciples' fear of God or Jesus are not discussed here.

[25] Blackburn, *Traditions,* 226, notes that he knows of no instances in secular Hellenistic literature where fear is given as the response to a miracle. For instances in the LXX, cf. Exod 14:31; 1 Sam 12:16-18; Jonah 1:16; Dan 6:26.

sparingly than Mark, and only applies it to the crowds once at 9:8, where it describes their reaction to the healing of a paralytic. In this instance, it suggests awe or fear arising from a confrontation with the divine or numinous: the fear typically associated with an epiphany.[26] In this case, however, it could signify a reaction subsequent to amazement, or a reaction that is more profound.[27] There is a textual variant on 9:8 with ἐθαύμασαν as the variant reading,[28] apropos of which Metzger remarks: "Superficial readers and copyists, failing to see the deep meaning of "were afraid" (i.e., people felt a profound sense of awe and alarm in the presence of One who had the right to forgive sins), substituted for ἐφοβήθησαν what seemed to be a more appropriate word, ἐθαύμασαν ("marvelled," or "were astonished")."[29]

Metzger's observation does accord with the use of the word in relation to the disciples (14:27; 17:6,7). On the other hand, Matthew appears to indicate that fear is an inadequate response to Jesus on at least one occasion.[30] In the pericope of the stilling of the storm, Matthew transforms Mark's fearful disciples (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν Mark 4:41) into wondering men (οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν 8:27), who ask the very same question that Mark's disciples had. The probable explanation for this change is Matthew's wish to place the disciples in a better light by depicting them as individuals with true insight into Jesus' identity.[31]

Matthew's desire to characterize the disciples as "those who understand" is probably also responsible for his omission of Mark 9:32 and Mark 10:32 (if it refers to the disciples).[32] Thus, it seems better to suppose that, for the disciples at least, fear is an

---

[26] For discussions of φοβέομαι see: H. Balz, "φοβέομαι" *EDNT* III 429-32; H. Balz, "φόβος κτλ" *TDNT* IX, esp. 189-219; W. Mundle, "Fear, Awe," *NIDNTT* I 621-624; Schenk, *Sprache,* 455-57; Zizemer, *Verhältnis*, 124-125.

[27] Cf. Luke 5:26: ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου. Cf., further, Schenk, *Sprache,* 456.

[28] C, L, Θ and a number of miniscules read ἐθαύμασαν.

[29] Metzger, *Textual*, 24-25.

[30] Luz ("Disciples," 121#30) goes considerably further. He maintains that "in Matthew's, redaction fear is consistently understood as the expression of human unbelief and little faith."

[31] Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 35; and contrast Gundry (*Matthew*, 157), who tries unconvincingly to argue that the men are the disciples. Thompson ("Reflections," 374#26 and esp. 315-316#51) offers a more satisfactory discussion of the identity of "the men" on the beach.

[32] Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 152) makes the general observation that "über Jesu Worte gerät wohl das Volk, aber nicht die Jünger in 'grosse furcht.'" This is because the disciples understand the words and deeds of Jesus. Both Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 152-3) and Strecker (*Weg*, 192) account for the disciples' understanding as part of Matthew's tendency to "idealize" the disciples.

inappropriate reaction to Jesus.[33] The term may well designate a more profound sense of awe, but again, this would be an immediate and unconsidered reaction, one that is suggestive, at times, of a deficiency of understanding. As with θαυμάζω, however, the crowds' fear serves as the basis for a subsequent response; they move on to glorify God.

F *δοξάζω*

Matthew twice relates that the crowds glorify God. The first reads: "When the crowds saw it, they were afraid, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to men" (9:8). The second passage relates that "the throng wondered, …and they glorified the God of Israel" (15:31).[34] The position of δοξάζω in both sentences indicates that it is an action that appears to be consequent upon, and subsequent to, the crowds' initial reaction of fear or astonishment. If, as suggested above, these reactions of fear and astonishment are simply preludes, then the crowds' use of δοξάζω points to a more considered and deliberate action on their part.

Verse 9:8 is the conclusion of the healing of the paralytic pericope (Matt 9:1-8 // Mark 2:1-12 // Luke 5:17-26).[35] For the purposes of this discussion, there is no need to ascertain whether the pericope was originally a single unit or a fusion of a miracle story with a controversy dialogue.[36] Matthew has reworked his version in such a way as to bring the focus of the narrative onto the issue of Jesus' authority.[37] The crowds do not figure in the narrative until the concluding verse. Matthew has further eliminated Mark 2:7b and changed the crowd's choral ending from direct speech into indirect speech.[38] Some have argued that, as with Mark's account, the miracle itself prompted the crowds' outburst, instead of their perception of Jesus' ability to forgive

[33] Two of the three occasions where the disciples are said to fear in Matthew (17:6,7) refer to fear in the presence of God at the transfiguration. This leaves 14:27 (cf. 14:26).

[34] Δοξάζω occurs 4 times in Matthew. It is twice used of the crowds—9:8 // Mark 2:12 // Luke 5:26 and 15:31—no //, and occurs twice in the Sermon on the Mount (5:16; 6:2). On the word itself, see: H. Hegermann, "δοξάζω" *EDNT* I 348-49; Gerhard Kittel, "δοκέω κτλ" *TDNT* II 232-235; Schenk, *Sprache*, 198.

[35] H. J. Klauck, "Die Frage der Sündenvergebung in der Perikope von der Heilung des Gelähmten (Mk 2,1-12 parr)," *BZ* 25 (1981) 246-247.

[36] Cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 14-16; Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 162-3.

[37] Held, *Tradition*, 176.

[38] On the first of these changes, cf. Klauck, "Frage," 246. On the relative infrequency of the second, see Sanders, *Tendencies*, 256-262.

sins.[39] This surmise seems unlikely though, both because of the deliberate repetition of ἐξουσία from verse 6, and because φοβέομαι, being used of no other healings, might here indicate a more profound sort of awe on the crowds' part.[40]

It appears, therefore, that Jesus' exercise of authority prompts their reaction, even if it is not at all clear that the crowds have any insight into his identity. As it stands, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις would make Jesus *primus inter pares*—one among perhaps many similarly gifted men.[41] For this reason, Schenk has attempted to argue that the dative here ought to be regarded as a *dativus commodi*, indicating that Jesus' authority is given *on behalf* of men.[42] His proposal, although attractive, is also, in Thyen's words, "highly improbable."[43] It cannot be said that the crowds' attitude expresses anything more than admiration for Jesus. They have recognized something laudable and they praise God for it.

At this point, however, one must recognize that some scholars find it difficult to confine verse 9:8 to the historical narrative,[44] arguing that 9:8b is an indication of the church's authority to forgive sins,[45] a theme developed explicitly elsewhere in Matthew (cp. 16:17-19 and 18:15-18). It is possible, then, that the evangelist has given the crowds a remark that pertains to the historical and transparent levels of the gospel.

Matthew's reformulation of the pericope prompts several other observations. First, the scribes again figure in the narrative and, as at 7:29, are seen to lack Jesus' authority. He, however, is able to demonstrate his ἐξουσία, and this elicits praise from the crowds. Matthew's

---

39 Paul Gaechter, *Das Matthäus Evangelium* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963) 289; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 169.

40 Allen (*St. Matthew*, 88) describes it as "more appropriate to the forgiveness of sins;" cf. DA II 96; Senior, *Matthew*, 114. On the repeated use of ἐξουσία, see Held, *Tradition*, 176, and W. Trilling, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (2 vols.; New York: Herder and Herder, 1969) I 160.

41 Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 38. One should not see a qualification of the Son of Man in τοῖς ἀνθρώποις—cf. M. J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1923) 179. Even less should one assume with Gundry (*Matthew*, 165) that "Jesus is the God whom the crowds glorify." The crowds' query about the Son of David at 12:23 indicates that they do not understand Jesus to be God.

42 Wolfgang Schenk, "Den Menschen Mt 9:8," *ZNW* 54 (1963) 272-275.

43 Hartwig Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 243: "höchst unwahrscheinlich." W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann (*Matthew* [AB 26; New York: Doubleday, 1971] 103) do countenance Schenk's view.

44 Strecker, *Weg*, 221.

45 Among others, see: Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 16; DA II 96; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 217#113; Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 76; Klauck, "Frage," 247; Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 38; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 224; Thompson, "Reflections," 376; Thyen, *Studien*, 242.

omission of "all" (Mark 2:12) stresses the scribes' failure to participate in the crowds' accolade of Jesus. Here the reaction of the scribes is implicitly contrasted with that of the crowds—a theme that comes to be developed further in Matthew's narrative.

The second observation is that Matthew has eliminated the crowds' response in direct discourse. This is rather unexpected, as direct speech is more vivid, and would have served to emphasize their favourable reaction better than the existing summary. Matthew, however, is sparing with his use of direct speech on the part of the crowds, and is more apt to use it at significant intervals in his gospel. Instead of having the crowds speak here, he waits until 9:33 where their outburst provides a fitting conclusion to the entire Messiah of Deeds sequence.

The second δοξάζω passage is 15:31, the final verse of a Matthean summary passage loosely based on Mark 7:31-37.[46] There are very considerable differences between Matthew's summary and its *Vorlage* in Mark. Matthew has eliminated Mark's healing of a deaf-mute and substituted in its place a summary of healings. As suggested above, the summary's echoes of 5:1—the configuration of a seated Jesus on a mountaintop where he is approached by crowds—indicates that it is meant to stand as a counterpart to the Sermon on the Mount. Where the latter provides a typical instance of Jesus' teaching, this account provides a generalized account of his therapeutic activity.

Matthew again puts the exclamation of Mark's crowd into indirect discourse, substituting Mark's almost banal "He has done all things well; he even makes the deaf hear and the dumb speak" (Mark 7:37), with "they glorified the God of Israel" (ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ).[47] Here, the absolute character of their praise, that is, praise without qualification (as opposed to 9:8), suggests a quality of reverence. There is more than a hint of a liturgical response, though not of the kind proposed by Minear.[48] Murphy O'Connor justly remarks that "glorification of God [is] not to be equated as acceptance of the person of Jesus,"[49] and the crowds offer no hint of worship, or even praise of Jesus. While the crowd in Mark acclaims Jesus, in Matthew the crowds praise God.[50] Nor does the verb δοξάζω suggest that reverence or faith in Jesus is implicit in this praise, as is made evident

---

[46] On Matthew's summary, see T. J. Ryan, "Matthew 15:29-31: An Overlooked Summary," *Horizons* 5 (1978) 31-42; Donaldson, *Mountain*, 122-135.

[47] Mark 7:37 reads: καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν, καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ [τοὺς] ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

[48] See further, Cousland, "Feeding," 21-23.

[49] Murphy O'Connor, "Structure," 377#44.

from the Sermon on the Mount—"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good words and give glory (δοξάσωσιν) to your Father who is in heaven" (5:16 no //).

Finally, while Isaiah 35:5 probably underlies Matthew's account, there is no indication that the crowds are aware of the fulfilment of prophecy. If Ryan is correct, the purpose of the summary is to contrast the attitude of the crowds with that of the Pharisees.[51] The Pharisees honour God with their lips (15:8), while the crowds do so with their hearts. Such a correlation places the crowds in a distinctly favourable light. Nevertheless, the crowds do not worship Jesus, but God, and their predisposition, though in itself laudable, stops short of any sign of commitment to or of faith in Jesus. This judgement is in some measure confirmed by the fact that the disciples never give glory (δοξάζω) to either God or Jesus—instead they worship Jesus (προσκυνέω 14:33; 28:17).

The crowds glorify God quite simply because, within their experience, he is their healer. In God's ordinance at Exodus 15:25-26, for example, Yahweh promises Israel that if they diligently hearken to his voice, he will put none of the diseases on them that he put on the Egyptians. The same tenor is evident in a number of passages from the prophetic tradition, which again associate Israel's obedience with God's healings.[52] As he says to them, "I am the Lord, your healer" (Ex 15:26). The crowds' reaction is directed at God, and has more than casual affinities with the eighth *berakhoth* of the *Shemoneh `Esreh*—"Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed, save us and we shall be saved; for thou art our praise. And bring perfect healing to all our wounds. For thou art a God and King who heals, faithful and merciful. *Blessed art thou, Lord, who healest the sick of thy people Israel.*"[53]

In sum, the above examination of Matthew's "wonder terminology" prompts two remarks. The first concerns the character of these reactions. It has to be stated that, with the exception of δοξάζω, the terminology cannot be described as indicating either an unambiguously positive or negative response.[54] Rather, it depicts a

---

[50] Beare, *Matthew*, 346.
[51] Ryan, "Summary," 39-42.
[52] Cf. Kee, *Medicine*, 12-16.
[53] Translation from *HJP* II 457 (italics theirs).
[54] By way of contrast, see O. Perels (*Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung* [BWANT 12; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer] 1934 27#6) who, speaking of this type of reaction in the Synoptic Gospels, states that "Alle diese Gefühle sind als positive Stellung zu Jesu Tat oder Wort anzusehen." Perels is quoted with approval by H. Van der Loos (*The Miracles of Jesus* [NovTSup 8; Leiden: Brill, 1965] 129#2-7), who offers brief notes on the wonder terminology discussed above.

preliminary response that could, depending on the beholder, either lead to faith or away from it. In the case of the crowds, the gospel suggests a movement towards a favourable reaction. As the use of δοξάζω reveals, the crowds find in Jesus' deeds cause for giving thanks to God, even if it cannot be said that they find God in Jesus.

The second observation is that the disciples tend to be differentiated from the crowds. The fact that they do not commonly display the same sort of reaction as the crowds—or are rebuked for it when they do—suggests that Matthew considers these responses inappropriate for disciples. Instead, Matthew demonstrates that the disciples already know who Jesus is. They understand, and their worship of Jesus arises from this understanding.

G *The Responses of the Crowds in* Oratio Recta

At only two points in the first gospel does the astonishment of the crowd result in outbursts recorded in direct speech (9:32-34; 12:22-24).[55] The two passages are a doublet derived from Q,[56] and, as was suggested in Chapter Two above, it is best to regard the doublet as the reworking of a traditional passage standing in Q that also had points of agreement with Mark (cf. Mark 3:22). For the purposes of this discussion it is not important which element of the doublet is more original, though 9:32-34 appears closer to Luke 11:14 than 12:22-24.[57] Further, while 9:34 is textually disputed,[58] it is best taken as an integral part of the text.[59]

Given their common origin, the form of the two pericopae is, not surprisingly, similar. Jesus is brought a dumb (or dumb and blind 12:22) demoniac whom he heals, with the result that the man speaks (or speaks and sees 12:22). At this the crowds marvel (ἐθαύμασαν 9:33; ἐξίσταντο 12:23) and exclaim "Never was anything like this seen in Israel" (9:33), and "Can this be the Son of David?" (12:23). In both pericopae Mark's "scribes who came down from Jerusalem" (Mark

---

[55] Cf. 21:9,11. The crowds speak in *oratio recta* elsewhere at 27:21-23.

[56] Cf. Luke 11:14-15; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 212; Held, *Tradition*, 246-47; Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 63; Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 125.

[57] Christoph Burger, *Jesus als Davidssohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 77.

[58] The verse is omitted in D a k sy^{s} Hil.

[59] On the *status quaestionis*, see J. Neville Birdsall, "A note on the textual evidence for the omission of Matthew 9:34" in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A. D. 70 to 135* (WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 117-122. In favour of the integrity of the text see: Stanton, *New People*, 174-176; Metzger, *Textual*, 20-21.

3:22) are transmuted into Pharisees. The Pharisees respond in *oratio recta* to the exclamations of the crowds with immediate and derogatory replies to the effect that Jesus casts out demons by the prince of demons (9:34, 12:24). Thus, it is not Jesus' thaumaturgy that is emphasized in these two accounts so much as the two-fold reaction to Jesus.[60] The crowds' own response is either fear or amazement, followed by an exclamation in direct speech.

As noted above, the first of these remarks probably owes its origin to Mark 2:12(c) (οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἴδομεν), which Matthew omitted from the healing of the paralytic pericope in favour of the saying about authority to men (9:8). As is readily determined, Matthew's version of the exclamation is substantially similar—οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ(9:33). He has retained the οὕτως and the οὐδέποτε from Mark, with the remaining words being typical of Matthew.[61] The overall change in the sense of the passage, however, is considerable. The οὕτως, for instance, has an immediate reference to the dumb demoniac (as the Pharisees' response suggests), yet, is also amenable of a broader application. "Something like this" (οὕτως) can be extended to encompass all of the healings and exorcisms that the crowds have witnessed or heard about.[62]

In fact, Matthew's reference to Israel and his use of the passive ἐφάνη give the exclamation even broader parameters. Instead of limiting the crowds' response to their own experience—"*We* never saw anything like this," as Mark does, Matthew's version makes Jesus' activity the subject of the sentence. And while the passage may simply allude to Jesus' activity in "Israel at present," the emphatic position of οὐδέποτε with the second aorist of φαίνομαι suggests a temporal framework referring to the historical experience of Israel. Jesus' miracles are so singular that nothing like them has ever been seen before. Jesus' activity surpasses Elisha's healing of the leper Naaman (2 Kings 5:1-14), Elisha's restoration to life of the Shunammite woman's son (2 Kings 4:25-37), or Elijah's restoring of the widow's son to life (1 Kings 17:17-24).[63] Jesus' ministry is, in other words, unparalleled.

---

[60] Held, *Tradition*, 247.

[61] E.g., Ἰσραήλ, φαίνομαι, λέγοντες. Cf. Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 63.

[62] DA II 139. Theissen (*Miracle Stories*, 163) maintains that the same holds true for the crowds' exclamation at Mark 7:37.

[63] For a helpful overview of biblical miracle traditions, see Wendy Cotter, *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1999) 47-53. It is likely that extra-biblical traditions are also envisioned. Cf. the exorcisms of Abraham: 1 QapGen 20:16-29; David: 11QPs[a] 27; Ps.-Philo, *LAB* 60; Solomon: 11QPsAp[a]; Jos. *Ant.* 8:45-49; Daniel: 4QPrNab, as well as the healing of Tobit's blindness: Tob 11:7-15.

The crowds' reference to Israel also calls to mind their own status as the people of Israel. As was noted earlier, they stand in a continuum with their forebears, who witnessed and marvelled at the deeds of those empowered and sent by God. Now the crowds function as the current representatives of the people chosen by God and speak in that capacity. As such, they are able to pronounce with a certain authority on Jesus' activity. The whole episode, therefore, assumes a larger significance through its implicit reference to salvation history.

Still, at this point the crowds have not moved much beyond situating Jesus' marvels within the framework of *Heilsgeschichte*. While their astonishment leads them to remark on the healings and exorcisms they have witnessed, they have not yet begun to consider the identity of the one performing the healing,[64] a fact that is well brought out by the Pharisees' rejoinder, which likewise concentrates on Jesus' therapeutic activity—ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (9:34). It is Jesus' healings and exorcisms that produce the polarized responses to Jesus. While the Pharisees dismiss his exorcism, the crowds appear to be on the right track. They ascribe Jesus' actions to God, and situate them within the salvation-historical framework of God's dealings with his people. It must be said, though, that if there is a christological interest on the part of the crowds, it is certainly a veiled one.[65]

The same cannot be said, though, of the crowds' second exclamation (12:23).[66] The crowds' interest has shifted from the activity of Jesus to Jesus himself, and Burger is certainly correct when he discerns "a clear intensification"[67] in this pericope as compared with 9:32-34. The crowds appear to be moving toward nascent christological awareness. It remains to ask, though, how much of an awareness? Some commentators have understood their question—μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ;—as tantamount to an identification with the Son of David.[68] On the other hand, the force of the μή has sometimes been pressed, so that the crowds' question is understood to

---

[64] David, Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1972) 181.

[65] Held, *Tradition*, 248#2.

[66] This verse is probably composed by Matthew; cf. Burger, *Davidssohn*, 79; Fuchs, *Sprachliche*, 97. Against this view, cf. E. Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966) 151-152.

[67] Burger, *Davidssohn*, 78: "eine deutlich Steigerung"; cf. Held, *Tradition*, 248#2.

[68] Burger, *Davidssohn*, 77-79; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 118-119; Alexander Sand, *Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus* (Biblische Untersuchungen II; Regensberg: Friedrich Pustet, 1974) 146.

anticipate the answer "No."[69] The most satisfactory position lies somewhere between these extremes. Certainly the μήτι should not be ignored, yet it does not always suggest a categorical "no," nor anticipate a negative answer (cf. John 4:29).[70] Here, it indicates an "inquiring conjecture."[71] Jesus' healing has astonished the crowds and led them to broach the question of whether he might be the Son of David. The question is only broached, however; and at this point, it cannot be said that the crowds know who Jesus is. Rather, they are struggling towards such knowledge.[72]

As before, the crowds are juxtaposed with the Pharisees. Characteristically, Matthew makes it the Pharisees who dispute with the crowds,[73] where in Mark the disputants are scribes from Jerusalem (Mark 3:22) and in Luke "some of the multitude."[74] Matthew uses deliberate parallelism to contrast the responses of the two groups. The Pharisees' response to the crowds' οὗτος …εἰ μὴ directly echoes the crowds' μήτι οὗτός.[75] The parallelism of the two replies helps to emphasize their antithetical disparity.

More importantly, the exchange leads to an intensification of the judgements that the two groups had made earlier at 9:32-34. The Pharisees repeat the charge that they had made before: "he casts out demons by the prince of demons," but now go on to identify the prince of demons as Beelzebul. The crowds, by contrast, now emerge with a tentative identification of Jesus as "Son of David." The

---

[69] See Jack Dean Kingsbury, "The Verb AKOLOUTHEIN ('to follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of his Community," *JBL* 97 (1978) 61. Matera (*Christology*, 36) detects "a tinge of cynicism."

[70] See BDF 427(2); Moulton, *Grammar*, III 283; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (3rd ed; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919) 917.

[71] The phrase "inquiring conjecture" ("fragende Vermutung") is Suhl's ("Davidssohn," 72). Cf., in addition: H. Balz, "μήτι" *EDNT* II 426; Duling, "Therapeutic," 401; Gibbs, "Purpose," 458; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament I; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968) 328-329; Haenchen, *Weg*, 137; Lagrange, *Saint Matthieu*, 241; Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1915) 174; Trilling, *St. Matthew*, I 225; Lohse ("υἱὸς Δαυίδ" *TDNT* VIII 478-488) has "inkling of the truth" ("ahnenden Begreifens" *TWNT* VIII 490).

[72] Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 74; *pace* Kingsbury; "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 95 (1976) 600.

[73] R. A. Edwards (*The Sign of Jonah: The Theology of The Evangelists and Q* [SBT 2 ser. 18; London: SCM, 1971] 101-102) goes so far as to say that here the Pharisees become "a type of the anti-disciple."

[74] Cf. Luke 11:14: ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι and Luke 11.15: τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον κτλ.

[75] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 145.

polarity already evident at 9:32-34 becomes increasingly pronounced, and the crowds, despite the interference of the Pharisees, move toward an (apparently) accurate assessment of Jesus.[76]

Thus, when both the content and context of the above pericopae are considered, a favourable picture emerges, one which suggests that the crowds, if they have not yet penetrated the question of Jesus' identity, are at least moving in that direction. In contrast, the portrayal of the Pharisees is blackened. The very actions that provoke an instinctive awareness of Jesus on the part of the crowds impel the Pharisees to pronounce ever more virulent rejections of Jesus, culminating in blasphemy (12:31).

H *Matthew's Use of the Responses*

The responses of the crowds prompt a number of observations, and provide further confirmation for some of the suppositions made in previous chapters. First, Matthew has subtly altered the form of the Marcan miracle traditions.[77] As is well known, the reactions of amazement and astonishment ascribed to the crowds are a feature of the "wonder motif" characteristic of miracle stories.[78] In the individual miracle story or paradigm,[79] "choral endings" typically come at the end of an individual story. Matthew has departed from this pattern in two ways. First, where the choral endings of the crowds in Mark are generally bound to individual pericopae (even if, as in the case of Mark 7:37, they may sometimes have a broader application), Matthew's have become almost global in their scope.

At 7:28-29, the "choral ending" has been removed from the context of an individual story, and been made to apply to the entire discourse. The Sermon on the Mount is substituted for a single teaching story, and the reaction of the crowds, by virtue of this piece of editing, is made to refer to an extensive body of Jesus' teaching.

---

[76] The discussion in the next chapter will argue that "Son of David" is, in fact, an appropriate title for Jesus.

[77] Dwyer (*Wonder*, 22) also notes considerable differences between Matthew and Mark. He observes that "Both use such reactions, but there are crucial differences. Matthew is more stereotyped than Mark, less intensive, less varied and less mysterious. The motif is more frequent in Mark."

[78] On the wonder motif, see Blackburn, *Traditions*, 225-227; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 225-226; Dwyer, *Wonder*, 26-91; Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 69-71.

[79] Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 225-226) uses the term "miracle story," while Martin Dibelius (*From Tradition to Gospel* [London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934] 57, 71) prefers the expression "paradigm."

Given the representational character of the discourse, it being the only major instance where substantial content is given to the verb διδάσκω, it is likely that the choral ending is meant to typify the crowds' overall reaction to Jesus' teaching.

The same can be said of the crowds' exclamation at 9:34, "Never was anything like this seen in Israel!" Here, again, the placement of the crowds' outburst is highly significant. While it certainly applies to the healing of a dumb demoniac, it has a much broader purview, and is to be taken as a fitting summation to the healings described in the "Messiah of Deeds" sequence (8:1-9:34). The crowds' response typifies their reactions to Jesus' healings, just as their response to the Sermon on the Mount typified their response to Jesus' teaching.

In both these instances, Matthew has moved to globalize Jesus' activity and the responses to it. Instead of the discrete individual narratives so typical of Mark, Matthew has moved to larger blocks of teaching and healing, designed to epitomize Jesus' ministry. The same holds true for the crowds' responses. They are to be taken as characteristic and typical of the crowds as a whole. The crowds' reaction then, should be regarded as typical of Israel, as distinct, of course, from that of their leaders.

The second feature of note is that there is a distinction between the crowds' reactions to Jesus' teaching and his healing miracles.[80] While this distinction was mentioned in passing in the previous chapter, the analysis provided here makes it especially vivid. The verb ἐκπλήσσομαι is confined to responses to Jesus' teaching, and points to a characteristic reaction on the part of the crowds. They recognize that Jesus' teaching is different from that of the scribes, but that is as far as it goes. His *didachê* elicits no further responses from the crowds, as is made evident by the similarity of 22:33 to 7:29. Their responses to his healings, however, twice result in praise to God, and twice occur in direct speech.

Yet, it is not simply the variety of response that indicates increasing involvement on the part of the crowds, but the fact that there is a clear progression in their awareness. Mark' s crowd, by contrast, concentrates only on the deeds of Jesus.[81] The *Chorschluss* is constant and unchanging in its emphasis. With Matthew's crowds, there is a marked shift from amazement with the miracles (9:33) to an interest in the doer of the miracles (12:23). Even more marked is their

[80] As is the case with Mark, the crowds do not marvel at any of Jesus' miracles except healings or exorcisms.

[81] Mark 1:22; **1:27**; **2:12**; 5:42; **7:37**; 11:18. The references in bold type indicate statements made by the crowd.

sharpening awareness and perceptions of Jesus as thaumaturge (9:8), to (perhaps) the Son of David (12:23), to (emphatically) the Son of David (21:9). Evidently, Jesus' healings foment an increased understanding on the crowds' part. The overall result is to show the people of Israel instinctively moving toward recognition of their Messiah.[82]

This feature is, perhaps, the most significant difference between Matthew and Mark. Because of the diverse and occasional constitution of Mark's crowds, there is no development, nor can there be any, in their perceptions of Jesus. Never, in Mark's miracle stories does the crowd respond with a titular acclamation. By contrast, the remarks of the crowds in Matthew are overtly theological in that they refer not simply to the Son of David, but also to Israel. At the same time, however, it is not appropriate to describe the crowds' responses as liturgical or confessional, at least with respect to Jesus. While they do recognize that he is an emissary of God, he is neither praised nor worshipped. The crowds glorify God alone, even if they are moving ever closer to a fuller understanding of Jesus.

Matthew is also able to demonstrate the crowds' increasing awareness through the inclusion of references to the Jewish leaders, who function as a foil to the crowds. Even if they are not present for all of the crowds' responses, they are present, as was shown earlier, for most. The scribes are referred to at 7:29, and are critical of Jesus for presuming to forgive sins at 9:3. The Pharisees expressly reject the crowds' insights at 9:34 and 12:24, and attempt to confound Jesus at 22:34. While no leaders are mentioned at 15:31, they are conspicuous by their absence. Instead of blind guides, the people of Israel now have a guide who heals the blind, and it may well be that, as Ryan has argued, the Pharisees are implicitly contrasted with the people who honour God with their hearts. In any event, it is notable that the crowds are always distinguished from their leaders but not usually dissociated from them.

The conjunction of the two groups demonstrates, at one level, how perceptive the crowds are. It likewise shows how fully the Pharisees warrant their epithet as 'blind guides.' With such misapprehensions about the nature of Israel's true messengers of God, it is no wonder that they acknowledge themselves to be the children of those who killed the prophets (23:31). They, unlike the crowds, are ignorant of Jesus' true nature, yet they are set on undermining his influence with the crowds. They attempt to subvert the crowds' dawning

[82] So, too, Twelftree, *Miracle Worker*, 139, 141; Vledder, *Conflict*, 232.

perceptions; as the people's awareness grows so too does the malice and perfidy of their leaders. Their true standing as evil shepherds, therefore, emerges most characteristically in these exchanges with the crowds.

I *Conclusion*

The above passages disclose something of an incipient, favourable response to Jesus on the part of the crowds. While the verbs of amazement and fear generally display nothing of this, the crowds' use of δοξάζω, and the remarks that they make support this contention. Their openness to Jesus is also evident when it is contrasted with the Pharisees' intransigence. On the other hand, when the crowds' attitude is compared with that of the disciples a marked difference also emerges. In general, the disciples are not overcome with wonder in the face of Jesus' words and deeds. For them, this preliminary reaction has been superseded by understanding, and by worship of Jesus. It is clearly the disciples who have faith in Jesus and worship him, while the crowds do not. This latter possibility does not necessarily appear to be denied the crowds, but there is, nonetheless, a gulf fixed between the disciples and them, just as there is between the Pharisees and them. In this respect, one might say that Matthew has described a spectrum of reactions to Jesus' words and deeds—the Pharisees situated at one side, the disciples at the other, while the ὄχλοι occupy the middle.

It remains to ask why Matthew has represented the crowds in this light. One clear reason is christological. The ὄχλοι act as a foil to Jesus' words and deeds. Their astonishment, fear, and glorification of God continually emphasize the extraordinary and unprecedented character of Jesus' deeds. They function as naïve witnesses to his messianic actions. They function, moreover, as witnesses to their own Messiah. As representatives of Israel, they situate Jesus within the continuum of God's messengers. Indeed, they instinctively come to a growing awareness of his true identity, the son of David.

There is also a notable apologetic tendency. The intimations of *Heilsgeschichte* in the crowds' responses are designed to situate Jesus within the context of Israel's salvation history. The people recognize from his deeds that he is *sui generis*, somehow different from all the divine messengers who preceded him. Whatever "Son of David" might mean, Jesus evidently owes his authority to God, and the crowds instinctively recognize the fact. The crowds' adulation, therefore, stresses the quondam favourable reaction of the Jewish crowds to Jesus, and their onetime amazement at his actions. Of a

piece with this is the anti-Pharisaic polemic, which reveals the Pharisees' wilful misunderstanding and their deliberate attempts to subvert the crowds. (It is not without reason that Matthew makes the crowds auditors of Jesus' antipharisaic discourse in Chapter 23.) Although still *in nuce* here, Matthew's portrayal places some of the blame for the crowds' failure to understand clearly on the Pharisee's shoulders.

CHAPTER SEVEN

A *ἀκολουθέω*

The previous chapter established that the crowds' astonishment and glorification of God does not mark them out as disciples, even if they display a laudable openness to Jesus and his ministry. What then is to be said about the crowds' predilection for following Jesus?[1] It is one of their most distinctive traits in the first gospel, and for this reason, it is also one of the most controverted. Does the crowds' following of Jesus demonstrate any allegiance on their part, or has Matthew emphasized it for different reasons? The examination below will consider the various passages where the crowds are described as following Jesus, and explain why this motif is such a pervasive one in the gospel. In so doing, it will determine whether the crowds' following does disclose any disciple-like commitment to Jesus.[2]

As with many of the traits he attributes to the crowds, Matthew has appropriated a single instance from Mark and elaborated upon it considerably. Of Matthew's nine insertions of the word ἀκολουθέω, four are associated with the crowd(s),[3] and the ascription of following

---

[1] According to K. Aland (*Spezialübersichten*, 12), ἀκολουθέω is found in Matthew 25 times, Mark 18 times, and Luke 17 times. Of the gospel's 25 occurrences of the word, nine are inserted by Matthew: 4:22 (cf. Luke 5:11); 8:1; 8:23; 9:27; 10:38; 14:13 (cf. Luke 9:11); 19:2; 19:28 and 20:29. Matthew has taken 8:10 (Luke 7:9) and 8:19 (Luke 9:57) from Q, and has not adopted a number of Mark's uses of the word: Mark 2:15; 6:1; 8:34; 9:38; 10:32 and 14:13.

[2] On ἀκολουθέω, see: T. L. Aerts, "Suivre Jésus: Evolution d'un thème biblique dans les évangiles synoptiques," *ETL* 42 (1966) 476-512; H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament* (BHT 37; Tübingen: Mohr, 1967) 33-36; C. Blendinger, "Disciple," *NIDNTT* I 480-483; Warren Carter, "Matthew 4:18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective," *CBQ* 59 (1997) 58-75; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: University Press, 1964) 95-96; G. Eichholz, *Bergpredigt*, 23; Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*, 63-83; M. Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981) 40#9, 59#84, 85; Jones, *Matthean Parables*, 235; Kingsbury, "AKOLOUTHEIN," 56-73; Gerhard Kittel, "ἀκολουθέω" *TDNT* I 210-216; Minear, "Crowds," 30; Murphy O'Connor, "Structure," 376#44; Russell, "Image," 429; Schenk, *Sprache*, 347-49; Gerhard Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω" *EDNT* I 49-52; Anton Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen: Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentliche Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik* (SANT 6; Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1962) 63-64; Strecker, *Weg*, 230-232; Thysman, *Communauté*, 20#5; C. H. Turner, "Notes," 238-240; Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.

[3] Only one of the inserted passages (9:27) is not concerned with either the crowds or the disciples. The four insertions relating to the crowd(s) are: 8:1 ὄχλοι πολλοί; 14:13 ὄχλοι πολλοί; 19:2 ὄχλοι πολλοί; 20:29 ὄχλος πολύς. All four passages are editorial.

to the crowds receives considerably more emphasis than it does in the Marcan account.[4] Mark explicitly associates "following," ἀκολουθέω, with the ὄχλος only once (Mark 5:24). As for implicit references, it is possible to construe Mark's "many who followed him" (Mark 2:15b) as a reference to the crowd, though it could just as well refer to the disciples. The same holds true for the "great multitude from Galilee" at Mark 3:7, for "those who followed" in Mark 10:32, and, finally, for "those who went before and those who followed" in the Triumphal Entry narrative at Mark 11:9. As for Luke, he only associates the ὄχλος with following twice: Luke 7:9 and 9:11. Matthew's expansion of the motif, therefore, is not inconsiderable.

Although ἀκολουθέω can refer to the literal following of someone (e.g., 9:19), in Matthew it more commonly has the metaphorical sense of following as a disciple.[5] Matthew's usage of the word is manifestly influenced by christological concerns. Jesus is usually made the object of the verb,[6] and Matthew has modified his sources to have Jesus appear almost invariably as the cynosure.[7] In Matthew, Jesus leads and all others follow.

This strong association between the crowds and following Jesus in Matthew has led some scholars to suppose, not unnaturally, that Matthew represents the crowds as adherents of Jesus. Russell maintains that the crowds "appear on the fringe of discipleship and can be said to follow him."[8] Minear is more definite: "in most cases the *ochloi* who follow Jesus have responded to his call and accepted his message."[9] Van Tilborg is more categorical yet: "the following of Jesus is the definition of the essence of being Christian … the ὄχλοι do what they have been asked to do by Jesus."[10]

---

[4] From his sources, Matthew has retained the following of the crowds at 4:25 and 12:15 (cf. Mark 3:7 *v.l.*) and 21:9 (cf. Mark 11:9). To these one might add the τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν of 8:10 from Q (cf. Luke 7:9), as the verse's proximity to Matthew 8:1 could suggest that Jesus is addressing the crowds mentioned there. Cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 252; Gundry, *Matthew*, 144.

[5] Schenk, *Sprache*, 347.

[6] Jesus is always the object of the following, except at 9:19 where he follows the ruler. While the verb at 9:27 (αὐτῷ *v.l.*) and the participles at 8:10 and 21:9 are used absolutely, Jesus is the implicit object. Otherwise, the verb always occurs with the dative, except for the καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου at 10:38, a phrase that is probably meant to recall Elisha's following of Elijah at 1 Ki 19:20: καὶ ἀκολουθήσω ὀπίσω σου.

[7] Schenk, *Sprache*, 347.

[8] Russell, "Image," 430. Presumably he is speaking metaphorically here.

[9] Minear, "Crowds," 30; cf. Draper, "Paraenesis," 45.

[10] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164. Twelftree (*Miracle Worker*, 384#117) maintains that "Matthew is portraying the masses following him with at least some positive, even if limited, understanding and discipleship."

There are some grounds for their supposition. The same word, after all, is employed to characterize the relation of both the crowds and disciples to Jesus. Why should ἀκολουθέω be regarded as literal in one instance and metaphorical in the other, when both the crowds and disciples do much the same thing? As Van Tilborg remarks, "the crowds do the same as the disciples have done: they follow Jesus."[11] Nor is it simply the case that the same word happens to be used of the two groups; the association between the two has been emphasized by the evangelist in other ways.

First, there is explicit parallelism between the following of Jesus' disciples and that of the crowds. Both groups not only appear for the first time in Matthew's chapter four, but also appear in episodes proximate to each other. The crowds are described as following Jesus (4:25) a scant few verses after the very same is said of Peter and Andrew (4:20) and of John and James (4:22). The conjunction of these pericopae (4:18-22 with 4:23-25) is unique to Matthew. The effect is further enhanced by the inclusion of ἀκολουθέω at 4:22, which establishes a thematic link between the two episodes, anticipating what will be said of the crowds. No sooner do the disciples follow Jesus than the crowds do so as well.

Schenk has argued that this parallelism between the disciples and the crowds holds true for Jesus' entire public ministry. Matthew's editorial inclusions help to promote the theme of discipleship.[12] The reference to the crowds' following of Jesus at 8:1, for instance, anticipates passages concerned with discipleship such as the complex at 8:18-22 (cf. 8:10). Similarly, the crowds' following of Jesus at 19:2 and 20:29 frames the discussion of discipleship prompted by the rich young ruler's disinclination to become an adherent of Jesus (19:21,28). Although the ruler decides against following Jesus (19:21-22), the crowds who have followed Jesus thus far continue to do so. The parallel episode in the second gospel also mentions the gathering of the crowd (Mark 10:1 "gathered to him"; Mark 10:46 "leaving"), but it is described as following Jesus only once, during the Galilean ministry (Mark 5:24 cf. Mark 3:7). The crowds in Matthew, by contrast, are said to follow him right into Jerusalem (19:2; 20:29; 21:9), displaying an adherence to Jesus very much akin to that of his disciples.[13]

[11] Van Tilborg, *Leaders,* 164.
[12] Schenk, *Sprache*, 348.
[13] Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω," 50-51.

Further support for this position comes from the observation that the references to the following of Jesus are closely linked to miracle stories.[14] Luz has recognized that "it is striking…that frequently it is the crowds who follow Jesus, and secondly in the redactional passages without exception the experience of the miracle follows only after the mention of discipleship."[15] These observations prompt him to query whether discipleship might not be intimately connected with miracle working: "Does Matthew mean that discipleship to Jesus leads to the experience of his power to do miracles?"[16] Luz merely poses the question, so it is not apparent whether he regards the crowds as participants in Jesus' ἐξουσία, and, if so, how such participation would occur. What matters for Luz is that the crowds, in following Jesus, resemble the disciples in being proximate to Jesus' miracle working. He suggests that they, "by following, belong together with the disciples."[17]

The issue, however, is perhaps not so straightforward as the above analysis would suggest. One factor in particular militates against such an understanding, and that is the problem of Jesus' call. If the crowds are to be regarded as nascent disciples of Jesus, how is it that he never enjoins them to follow him? Can it really be said that the crowds do what they have been asked to do by Jesus? Does he, in fact, demand anything of the crowds?

B *The Crowds and the Demands of Jesus*

In terms of Jesus' day-to-day directives to them, the crowds appear to do what Jesus requires of them. They come when he summons them (15:10), leave when he dismisses them (14:22, 23; 15:39), sit on the ground when he bids them to do so (14:19; 15:35), and listen when he addresses them (11:7,14,15; 13:9; cf. 11:7-12:50; 13:3-34; 23:1-39). Yet, in Matthew's gospel this is all that Jesus requires of them. They are not, expressly at least, asked to do more.

On the other hand, Matthew gives several indications that the crowds' perceptions are deficient, and that they are in want of understanding. Such an impression is conveyed by 11:14-15. Both

---

[14] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64; cf. Kingsbury, "AKOLOUTHEIN," 61; Alexander Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Regensburger Neues Testament I; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986) 88; Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω," 50-51.

[15] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.

[16] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.

[17] Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 201.

verses are Matthean.[18] Verse 11:14 consists of an exceptionally clear identification of John the Baptist with Elijah: Jesus tells the crowds "if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who is to come,"[19] while in 11:15 he gives the crowds an injunction to hear: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear." As Hagner has recognized, this injunction typically follows upon Jesus' more difficult pronouncements and contains not only an appeal to the intellect, but also one to the will.[20] Other scholars have also regarded it as tantamount to a warning.[21] The crowds need to attend carefully if they are to understand who John is, and, more importantly, recognize who Jesus is. Hearing is the first step involved in understanding, the latter being a characteristic that, in Matthew, is typical of the disciples.[22]

It soon becomes apparent, however, that the crowds do not understand, and that Jesus' warning goes unheeded. At 17:12, in a significant amplification of Mark (cf. Mark 9:13), Jesus says of John that Elijah has already come, and "they did not know him" (καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν). While the plural here is impersonal, it may refer to the crowds or the crowds and their leaders.[23] Even if it is only a reference to the leaders of Israel, the crowds' deficient understanding of the Baptist can be seen elsewhere. Where Jesus has described John to them as more than a prophet (περισσότερον προφήτου 11:9), the crowds continue to regard him simply as a prophet (ὡς προφήτην 14:5, 21:26). Given the extent to which the Baptist's ministry prefigures and parallels that of Jesus, as well as his role as Elijah, their receptivity could suggest a limited awareness of Jesus' own role and mission.[24]

---

[18] Gundry, *Matthew*, 211.

[19] See J. Meier, "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 99 (1980) 397; W. Trilling, "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus," *BZ* 3 (1959) 279-280; Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS 7; Cambridge: University Press, 1968) 80; Yamasaki, *John the Baptist*, 134.

[20] Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 308.

[21] J. Schönle, *Jesus und die Juden. Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt 11* (BBET 17; Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1982) 129-159; Trilling, "Täufertradition," 281; Wink, *John the Baptist*, 32.

[22] Barth, *Tradition*, 105-12; Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 140-43; Zumstein, *Condition*, 203-6.

[23] Hill, *Matthew* 269; Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 73-4; McNeile (*St. Matthew*, 253) also includes the possibility of the scribes; Siegfried Pedersen, "Die Proklamation Jesu als des eschatologischen Offenbarungsträgers (Mt 17:1-13)," *NovT* 17 (1975) 263; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 351. Against this view, see Fenton, *St. Matthew*, 280; Gaechter, *Matthäus Evangelium*, 574.

[24] The crowds' inabilty to hear and understand emerges even more vividly in the Parable discourse (13: 10-17), a topic that will be discussed in more detail below.

The crowds' limitations are made more explicit in the pericope of the mother and brothers of Jesus (12:46-50). In Mark, Jesus suggests that the crowd does the will of God (Mark 3:31-35). In Matthew, it is no longer the crowd, but the disciples who are described as doing God's will or, as always in Matthew, the will of the Father.[25] R. H. Gundry, however, demurs at this interpretation. He maintains that Jesus does not address his words concerning those who do the will of God—i.e., his disciples—to the crowds, but to the individual who has just announced the presence of Jesus' mother and brothers outside. In Gundry's view, this change derives from Matthew's supposed equation of the crowds with disciples: "Jesus no longer speaks to the crowds *about* his disciples, but to the anonymous herald about the crowds *as* his disciples."[26] According to Gundry, Jesus' stretching out of his hand characteristically identifies the crowds with the disciples.[27]

Gundry's interpretation of the pericope is rather idiosyncratic. Even granting the existence of the "herald" (τις) in Matthew's text,[28] is it really the case that the identification of the crowds with the disciples is characteristic of Matthew? Such an assumption ignores the distinctions between the two groups that are preserved throughout the gospel, and not least those made in chapter 13, which follows immediately upon this pericope.[29] For that matter, it overlooks the distinctions made in the pericope itself. It is odd, for instance, that Matthew should remove Mark's description of Jesus "looking around" (περιβλεψάμενος) at those who sat about him (Mark 3:34), in favour of one where Jesus "stretches out his hand," or better, "points"[30] at his disciples, if this was meant to include everyone but the "herald". Does Jesus point at everybody? If so, why should Jesus exclude the "herald"? It makes far more sense to suppose that Matthew has Jesus point at the disciples in order to distinguish them from the crowds. Just how much this distinction does, in fact, underlie his account can be seen from further consideration of the roles assumed by the two groups in Matthew's version of the passage.

The most remarkable change from Mark to Matthew is that the crowds are marginalized. They are no longer, as they are in Mark,

---

[25] τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου 7:21; 12:50; 18:14: 21:31 (om. μου); τὸ θέλημά σου 6:10; 26:42. All but 12:50 are without parallel.

[26] Gundry, *Matthew*, 249.

[27] Gundry, *Matthew*, 249.

[28] As verse 12:47 [εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι.] is textually dubious, the reference to the "herald" (i.e., τις) is necessarily suspect.

[29] Wilkins, *Concept of Disciple*, 139.

[30] Here ἐκτείνω means "I point at someone"—cf. BAGD s.v. ἐκτείνω.

regarded as Jesus' kinsmen. They are reduced to the role of auditors, and are, moreover, all but eliminated from the pericope. The only time they are mentioned is at the beginning of 12:46 in a genitive absolute construction used to bridge Matthew's sources. Matthew's account opens with Jesus speaking to the crowds, but the crowds themselves remain silent until the end. They do not tell him of the arrival of his family members, rather, it is a man—Gundry's "herald"—(τις) who tells him (12:48).[31] At the end of the pericope, it is the disciples who are singled out for Jesus' praise.

By contrast, Mark's crowd is given pride of place. Seated around Jesus, they are the first to speak, and it is they who tell him, in direct speech, "Your mother and your brothers are outside asking for you." The pericope culminates with Jesus identifying the crowd as members of his family.[32] They warrant such a privilege, Jesus implies, because they do the will of God. *They* are now his true family.

In Matthew, however, the crowds are not Jesus' true family. They do not do the will of the Father, nor, *eo ipso*, the will of Jesus (cf. 6:10b).[33] Rather, it is the disciples who perform the Father's will, and it is on this basis alone that they have assumed their role as members of Jesus' family. The γάρ at the beginning of 12:50 makes the inference explicit.[34] What is it, then, that the disciples have done that the crowds have left undone? And can the following of the crowds be said to have any bearing on the question?

It has to be said that "following" does enter into the equation, since the passage as a whole is concerned with the nature of discipleship. As Barth has noted, doing the will of God is "the essence and meaning of being a disciple."[35] Jesus' remarks, therefore, are designed to elucidate the consequences of being a disciple. Discipleship in Matthew involves heeding the absolute call of Jesus. As shall be seen shortly, this call entails the disciples' rejection of their own families upon being confronted with the higher demands of Jesus (10:37; 19:29a). They are to attach themselves to Jesus instead. In

---

[31] That is, assuming the presence of the "herald."

[32] καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος (Mark 3:32)...καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους (Mark 3:34). Robert P. Meye's attempt (*Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 148-152) to make Mark 3:34 refer to the twelve ignores Mark 3:32. The περὶ αὐτὸν in Mark 3:32 is expressly repeated in Mark 3:34 to show that the group in question is the crowd. See, instead, Freyne, *The Twelve*, 158-159.

[33] On the identity of the Father's will with Jesus' will, see Trilling, *Israel*, 190.

[34] Dupont, "Le point de vue," 239.

[35] Barth, *Tradition*, 102#1; B. Pryzybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought* (SNTSMS 41; Cambridge: University Press, 1980) 112.

performing the will of the Father, they necessarily disregard their own fathers (8:21-22) and acknowledge the fatherhood of God in a new sense. Similarly, when they carry out the will of the Father they necessarily become kinsmen of Jesus. They gain a new family, and this is doubtless a large part of the manifold (or hundredfold) eschatological blessings the disciples are to receive for having given up their own families and possessions (19:29). Those who follow Jesus as disciples become members of Jesus' family.

Evidently, this does not apply to the crowds. They are not part of Jesus' family because they do not do the will of the Father. This circumstance suggests, therefore, that their following is not connected with discipleship. If it were, then presumably they would be performing the will of the Father. Further, if the following that Matthew imputes to them were considered normative for discipleship, it is unlikely that Matthew would have changed Mark's pericope as drastically as he has. The very fact that he has virtually eliminated the crowds and stressed the disciples' kinship to Jesus indicates that ἀκολουθέω has a different signification for the crowds from what it has for the disciples. For the latter it denotes discipleship, for the crowds, something different.

Nevertheless, the crowds are not categorically excluded from the prospect of discipleship. That they are included among Jesus' auditors conveys the impression that they could choose to heed Jesus' call.[36] The impression is confirmed, in some measure, by the indefinite construction used at 12:50: "whoever (ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ) does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother." Its formulation as a conditional relative clause leaves open the possibility that the crowds may yet undertake to perform the will of God. Even if they are not presently among Jesus' kinsmen, they now know how to become such. At the same time, however, they are not directly summoned by Jesus to become his disciples. Does he do so elsewhere in the gospel?

---

[36] Even here, it needs to be asked how much the presence of the crowds should be stressed. Pryzybylski (*Righteousness*, 113) has argued that righteousness is related in meaning to doing the will of the Father. The two concepts are distinguished in the gospel on the grounds that the former is exoteric and the latter esoteric, and suggests that Jesus refers to righteousness in the Sermon on the Mount (5:6,10,20; 6:1,33) because the crowds are among Jesus' hearers. If this distinction is valid, Jesus'reference to doing the will of the Father may indicate that the presence of the crowds counts for very little in this pericope.

C *The Call of Jesus*

Apart from 12:50, does Jesus ever call the crowds or its individual members to follow after him? It is certainly the case with Mark's gospel. For Mark, as Malbon has observed, "the disciples, crowds, whoever—everyone is a potential follower."[37] Much the same can be said for Luke, where Jesus directs an injunction to follow him "to all" (πρὸς πάντας Luke 9:23). Yet, strikingly, it does not hold true for Matthew. In the first gospel, Jesus never enjoins the crowd to follow him.

A consideration of Jesus' exhortations to the disciples to follow him, or of his discussions of the consequences of following him, is especially revealing. Apart from Jesus' calling of individual disciples, there are three more general summons to discipleship in Matthew: 10:38; 16:24; 19:28. As will be made evident below, all three are aimed at the disciples, and all three give evidence of the radical and sacrificial obedience entailed in following Jesus as a disciple.

The first of these summons is probably derived from Q,[38] and is situated in the Mission discourse. The discourse is a Matthean creation and is expressly directed at the twelve disciples. It opens with the summoning of the twelve (10:1), continues with their commissioning at 10:5 ("these twelve"), and concludes, once more, with a reference to the twelve: "And when Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples..." (11:1). Both 10:5 and 11:1 are otherwise unparalleled in the Synoptic Gospels. Particularly noteworthy is the correspondence created between 10:1 and 11:1; Jesus summons "his twelve disciples" at the outset of the discourse and finishes instructing "the twelve" at its close. So, while the parallel passage in Luke is spoken to the great multitudes (συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Luke 14:25), in Matthew it is confined exclusively to the twelve.

A similar situation is evident in the second passage. It is common to all three Synoptic Gospels (Matt 16:24; Mark 8:34; Luke 9:23), but only in Matthew is it restricted to the disciples. In Mark, the adjuration "if any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me" (Mark 8:34) is addressed to the crowds only after Jesus has specifically summoned them: "and he

---

[37] Malbon, "Disciples," 110.

[38] Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 70-71. Kloppenborg (*Formation*, 78) sees it as a part of a series of 10 sayings (10:24-39) relating to mission that Matthew has collated from Q in the Q (i.e., Lucan) order. Cf., however, Mark 8:34-35 and Gos Thom 55.

called to him the multitude with his disciples" (Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Mark 8:34).[39] In Luke, as noted above, the invitation is directed "to all" (Luke 9:23). Matthew, however, has omitted any reference to the crowd. Jesus continues to speak solely to the disciples: "Then Jesus told his disciples..." (16:24).[40] The crowds, in contrast to the disciples, are not called upon to deny themselves.

Finally, at 19:28, Matthew has expanded upon Jesus' rejoinder to Peter, who has just stated, "We have left everything and followed you" (19:27 // Mark 10:28 // Luke 18:28). This expansion takes up the ἀκολουθέω of 19:27 and applies it explicitly to the twelve: "You who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones."[41] There the twelve disciples will have the privilege of judging the twelve tribes. Once more, those who have followed Jesus are identified as the twelve. Having made this pronouncement, Jesus goes on to speak of a broader sphere of adherents (πᾶς ὅστις 19:29) for whom the reference to following does not apply. In Mark and Luke, however, the disciples and the broader sphere of adherents are lumped together; Peter's question is immediately followed by, "there is no one who has left..." (οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν κτλ Mark 10:29, Luke 18:29). Again, Matthew has Jesus confine his call to follow, or his comments about the nature of that following, to the disciples.

D *Discipleship in Matthew*

Given that these passages are confined to the twelve, what do they disclose about the implications of following Jesus as a disciple?[42] The pericope about Jesus' true family (12:46-50) indicated that it involves sacrificing one's family. What else is entailed?

The first of the passages above, Matthew 10:38, is part of a sequence of verses concerned with the conditions of discipleship, Matthew 10:37-39. Verse 10:37 continues the theme of family developed in 10:34-36, with its two parallel asseverations declaring Jesus' primacy over family: he who loves his mother or father, or son

---

[39] Both Matthew and Luke change Mark's first ἀκολουθεῖν at 8:34 to ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν (Matthew 16:24) or ἔρχεσθαι (Luke 9:23) probably, in each instance, to give more emphasis to the imperatival ἀκολουθείτω.

[40] Fenton (*St. Matthew*, 273) remarks that "Mt has omitted the reference to *the multitude* (or crowds) ... probably because Matthew considers them incapable of receiving this teaching."

[41] Luke situates a related passage at 22:28-30 without any reference to ἀκολουθέω.

[42] The following overview is not designed to be exhaustive, but simply to remark on the salient features of these passages.

or daughter, more than Jesus is not worthy of him. It is difficult to determine whether the ἀκολουθεῖ at 10:38 is due to Matthew (vs. Luke 14:27 ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου) but, on balance, it probably is.[43] In any case, 10:38 is pivotal to the complex at 10:37-39. Being unworthy of Jesus (οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος) is the overt link with verse 10:38; it is not merely those who overvalue their families who are not worthy of Jesus, but those who do not take up their cross and follow him. While the precise background and signification of 10:38 are much debated,[44] it probably indicates that the disciple, in his symbolic association with Jesus, must practise self-denial and perhaps even renounce his own life.[45] That taking up the cross does indeed involve self-sacrifice is made evident by 10:39, a "future-reversal" saying, which expresses the paradox of discipleship: "he who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my [Jesus'] sake will find it."[46] Discipleship may well result in death. Here 10:39 is like 10:27 in that it helps to establish a broader context for the "following" in 10:38. Hence, 10:37-39, when taken as a whole, helps to elucidate what it means to follow Jesus as a disciple.

A related view of discipleship emerges in 16:24-25. Here, in distinction to 10:38, following is not expressed as a negative condition, but as one of a series of commands. Nevertheless, 16:24 and the verses that follow it again elaborate on the consequences of following Jesus. As these verses are a doublet to 10:38-39, it is no surprise that most of the elements repeat themselves.[47] Once more, there is an emphasis on attachment to Jesus (16:25 ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ // 10:39), self-abnegation (16:24 "let him deny himself"), and, finally, death (16:25). The only feature conspicuously absent is the renunciation of family.

Renunciation of family, however, does figure in the group of verses at 19:27-30 These verses are also common to the triple tradition. Peter describes the disciples as having left everything and followed Jesus. Precisely what everything may include is spelt out at 19:29:

---

[43] Fuchs, *Untersuchungen*, 80; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 57#60; Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 71.

[44] On the background, cf. DA II 222-223; on its interpretation in Matthew, cf. J. Schneider, "σταυρόω" *TDNT* VII 578-579.

[45] Schneider, "σταυρόω," 579. H.-W. Kuhn ("σταυρός" *EDNT* III 269) speaks of "*imitatio* in suffering."

[46] On the vexed question of the context of Matthew 10:39, see Ronald Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: University Press, 1989) 151.

[47] Here Matthew prefers Mark to Q, the same passages being found in both of his sources. For an overview and discussion of the doublet, cf. Sir John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909) 86-88.

houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or lands. In essence, the disciples have given up their families and possessions to become attached to Jesus—to follow *him*.

All told, therefore, these verses help to demonstrate that following Jesus as a disciple in the first gospel is a radical and a sacrificial act. It entails: 1) attachment to Jesus; 2) renunciation of family; 3) self-abnegation, which may include giving up all one's possessions;[48] and 4) the possibility of death.[49]

E *Jesus' Summons of Individual Disciples*

In addition to these collective exhortations, Matthew's gospel demonstrates a similar pattern when Jesus commands individuals to follow him: a disciple does not follow Jesus unless he has been commanded to do so first. How fundamental Jesus' authorization is for Matthew can be determined from the episode where Peter walks on the water (14:22,23). Peter did not undertake to move until he had been commanded to do so by Jesus.[50] Peter said, "'Lord, if it is you, bid me come to you on the water.' He said, 'Come'" (14:28-29). Held has rightly discerned in this passage an underlying concern with discipleship.[51] The rigours of discipleship are only to be embarked upon with Jesus' authorization. As with the Mission discourse in chapter 10, it is Jesus' ἐξουσία that empowers the disciple to do what would otherwise be impossible. Even then, there remains the possibility of doubt and failure.

Matthew's use of ἀκολουθέω conforms to the above pattern. The initiative is always seen to rest with Jesus. Such is the case with Peter and Andrew (4:18-20), James and John (4:21-22), the disciple who would bury his father first (8:21), and Matthew (9:9). It is also the case with the rich young ruler, although he refuses Jesus' summons (19:21-22). Even apparently literal instances of following are initiated by Jesus. When Jesus determines to go to the other side of the lake, Matthew relates that when Jesus "got into the boat, his disciples followed him" (8:23). Yet their following has already been initiated by Jesus at 8:18: "he gave orders to go over to the other side" (ἐκέλευσεν

---

[48] Carter ("Matthean Discipleship," 69-73) has questioned the extent to which discipleship entails worldy detachment in Matthew.

[49] The passages dealing with individual disciples fit in with this overview, e.g., 4:18-20; 8:19-20; 9:9 fit with my category #3, 4:21-22; 8:21-22 with #2, and all of these with #1.

[50] Barth, "Glaube," 287.

[51] Held, *Tradition*, 206.

ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν). Zumstein holds that Matthew's characteristic use of the verb "to command" (κελεύω) describes the rapport between Jesus and his disciples.[52] This is true, if Jesus' uniquely authoritative position is not overlooked. Three of the seven occurrences of the word in the gospel refer to those exercising temporal power,[53] and the parallel to Jesus' authority is obvious. Like a political ruler, Jesus commands and his subjects obey. Thus, the disciples' following of Jesus into the boat is also to be regarded as a command to discipleship.[54]

The same pattern is consistent with those instances where Matthew departs from Mark. Matthew has eliminated at least one incident in the second gospel where the disciples are described as following Jesus without first having been commanded to do so by Jesus. The description of the disciples following Jesus to Nazareth (καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Mark 6:1) is excised. It is possible that the disciples are included among the "many" at Mark 2:15,[55] and in the impersonal "they" at Mark 10:32,[56] but whatever their precise reference, these passages, too, have been omitted by Matthew.

This leaves only a few instances in the first gospel where Jesus has not initiated the following of his disciples. The first concerns the scribe mentioned at 8:19. Yet even he is probably not to be taken as a disciple, although this is grammatically possible from the mention of "another of the disciples" (ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν) at 8:21. Gundry has recently attempted, on the basis of Matthew's use of the word ἕτερος, to argue that the scribe must be a disciple. Gundry's examination of the term leads him to conclude that "Matthew uses ἕτερος unexceptionably [*sic*] for another of the same kind."[57] Since the scribe is succeeded by "another of the disciples," the scribe must, therefore, be one of the same kind, that is to say, another disciple. Yet the

---

52 Zumstein, *Condition*, 221.

53 Herod: 14:9; Pilate: 27:58, 64; cf. 18:25 (the king in the parable of the Unforgiving Servant). It is used of Jesus at 8:18; 14:19,28. Apart from Luke 18:40, κελεύω is not otherwise found in the canonical gospels.

54 Held, *Tradition*, 202. See also Bornkamm's perceptive remarks, *Tradition*, 55. Heil (*Sea*, 95-97) is too precipitate in his criticisms of Bornkamm and Held, since he fails to appreciate the role of following in this pericope.

55 Guelich (*Mark 1-8:26*, 102) takes it as a reference "to a larger number of disciples than the Twelve," while Gundry (*Mark*, 125) and Marcus (*Mark 1-8*, 227) incline to "toll-collectors and sinners."

56 Morna Hooker (*The Gospel according to Saint Mark* [BNTC; London, Hendrickson, 1991] 244-5) accounts them disciples; Gundry (*Mark*, 570) does not.

57 R. H. Gundry, "On True and False Disciples in Matthew 8:18-22," *NTS* 40 (1994) 434.

evidence Gundry adduces does not bear out his contention. Specifically, his appeal to "the same kind" is ambiguous and depends upon a confusion between generic and specific categories.

This confusion can be seen most vividly at 15:30. Here, Matthew has Jesus heal a number of individuals afflicted with various malaises. Jesus heals "the lame, the maimed, the blind, the dumb, and many others." The list closes with the mention of "many others" (ἑτέρους πολλούς). If one were to invoke Gundry's criterion, these "many others" would have to be "others of the same kind," that is to say, "many others with the same illnesses." Surely, however, the passage means "many others with different illnesses from those just mentioned."[58] Gundry's classification of them as "other disabled people" allows him to regard them as being of "the same kind,"[59] but at the cost of introducing an artificial generic category (the "disabled") that does not occur in the text. Yet, when ἕτερος is interpreted in terms of the specific categories that Matthew provides (the blind, the dumb, etc.), it must mean "others of different kinds." This being the case, Matthew does not always use ἕτερος to mean "another of the same kind." Like ἄλλος, it can signify a difference in kind.[60] And if it can signify a difference in kind elsewhere in Matthew, there is no pressing necessity to interpret it thus here. The scribe need not be—and probably should not be—interpreted as a disciple.

A second instance of a disciple's self-initiated following of Jesus is seen at 26:58, where Peter follows Jesus after his arrest without Jesus' express bidding. There are several possible explanations for this passage. It could be understood literally and so be the only instance of a disciple following Jesus without a metaphorical underpinning.[61] While this is entirely possible, the context suggests something more. It suggests that Peter's behaviour is portrayed as an antitype of discipleship, of following that has not been initiated by Jesus. Peter is not taking up his cross and following Jesus as he has been told to do. Instead, he comes "to see the end" (26:58). Nor does he live up to his

---

[58] BDF 306(2). Davies and Allison (DA II 568) remark that ἑτέρους πολλούς "serves to increase the range of illnesses."

[59] Gundry, "Disciples," 434.

[60] Allen (*St. Matthew*, 82) notes that ἕτερος is also used loosely for ἄλλος at 10:23 and 12:45. Robertson (*Grammar*, 748-50) offers a very different assessment of some of the passages to which Gundry appeals.

[61] So Aerts, "Suivre," 507. The literal sense of the word is found at 9:19 where both Jesus and the disciples follow the ruler. At 8:10, τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν are the crowds.

promise at 26:35, "Even if I must die with you I will not deny you." He denies Jesus, not once but three times. He is not demonstrating discipleship, but its obverse. Malbon has detected irony in the Marcan account of Peter's following,[62] and it is to be discerned in Matthew's account as well. The harsh contrast between Jesus' resolution when he is in the hands of the chief priests and Peter's irresolution before his accusers stresses the antitypical character of Peter's discipleship. All that Peter is prepared to sacrifice is his integrity and commitment to Jesus. At Jesus' instigation Peter can even walk on water; when he is left to his own initiative, he can do nothing other than deny his master.

Even if 26:58 and 8:19 are interpreted differently from the way they have been here, Matthew's gospel is still remarkable for the extent to which it has downplayed the individual initiative of the disciples. Virtually all of the following done by the disciples is initiated by Jesus.[63] When this finding is joined with the findings above, a generally consistent picture emerges. It is the disciples who do the will of God, and the disciples who are called upon to follow Jesus. The crowds, on the other hand, do not yet perform the will of the Father, nor are they ever summoned by Jesus to follow him. They are not called to the sacrificial lifestyle practised by the twelve, and thus they cannot be said to follow in the same sense that the disciples do. Are the crowds, then, entirely excluded from the proceedings? Is the oblique, conditional invitation at 12:50 all that has been accorded them?

F *Comfortable Words*

There is one passage in the gospel that does invite the crowds to come to Jesus, although it does not expressly mention following. Can this invitation be construed as a summons to discipleship? At 11:28-30, Jesus invites all who labour and are heavy laden to come to him and find rest. His invitation, as is well known, is part of a larger sequence of verses that also includes a thanksgiving (11:25-26) and a revelation saying (11:27).[64] While the provenance of these passages

---

[62] Malbon, "Disciples," 110.
[63] Or, in the case of 26:58, ought to have been initiated by Jesus.
[64] Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 159-60.
[65] H. D. Betz ("The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28-30)," *JBL* 86 (1967) 11-20) furnishes a helpful overview of the history of the interpretation of the passage.

has been much debated,[65] it is often conceded that 11:25-27 derives from Q,[66] and that 11:28-30 comes from Matthew's *Sondergut.*[67] It is also likely that Matthew has made some slight additions to his special source; the clause "learn from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart" reflects Matthean concerns and vocabulary.[68]

Stanton has argued that Jesus' invitation at 11:28-30 is directed at disciples. He contends that it is unclear why the crowds should be "toiling" whereas it is an apt description of the exertions entailed in discipleship. He also remarks that the invitation to the crowds does not fit especially well with the revelatory character of 11:25-27, which is more suited to an audience of disciples.[69]

The above features, however, can be interpreted in a different light. Reasons for the toiling of the crowds will be given shortly. As to Jesus' audience at 11:28, one solution is to see 11:25-27 as aimed at the disciples, and 11:28-30 as aimed at the people in general.[70] Given the composite nature of 11:25-30, it would hardly be unexpected. Yet, it is also possible that 11:25 is aimed at the crowds. For one thing, the last audience indicator that Matthew gives is at 11:7, where Jesus begins "to speak to the crowds concerning John," and neither of the editorial remarks at 11:20 or 11:25a gives any ground for postulating a change of audience. Further, the only other time Matthew uses the word νήπιος is where Jesus cites Psalm 8:3 to justify the adulation of the children (21:16). Here, they have just called out "Hosanna to the Son of David," repeating verbatim a part of the crowds' exclamation during the Triumphal Entry (21:9). This insight about Jesus has been imparted to the children, but might not the very same thing be said of the crowds: that they, too, have been granted a measure of revelation? Such an interpretation fits especially well, if "these things" (ταῦτα) at 11:25 are understood to refer to the mighty works of Jesus mentioned at 11:5,21,23.[71] Through Jesus' mighty

---

[66] Felix Christ, *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1970) 81.

[67] Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30* (JSNTMS 18; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987) 47-48; Stanton, "Creative" in *idem*, *New People,* 340; Strecker, *Weg,* 172.

[68] DA II 290; Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 57; Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 90-92; Stanton, "Creative," 340-42. The words μανθάνω and πραΰς (11:28-30) are typically Matthean. The above passage also disrupts the synonymous parallelism of the *inclusio* at 11:28-30. Gundry (*Matthew*, 219) would attribute the pericope in its entirety to Matthew.

[69] Graham Stanton, "Matthew 11:28-30: Comfortable Words?" in *idem*, *New People*, 372-75.

[70] Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 41.

[71] Hill, *Matthew*, 205.

works the crowds gain insight into Jesus' nature, and come to recognize him as the Son of David.

Where this interpretation fits less well is with chapter 13, which distinguishes the disciples from the crowds as recipients of revelation (13:10-16). Nevertheless, the two passages need not be seen as absolutely contrary. The crowds do not come to a complete understanding of Jesus' true nature, but what understanding they do achieve comes through his miracle working. While this would not be decisive on its own, at 11:28 the fact that Jesus extends his invitation to "all (πάντες) who labour" is more compelling. The likeliest supposition is that all Israel is included in his purview.[72]

If it does apply to all Israel, why should they be weary and heavy laden?[73] Apart from Stanton's suggestion above, two answers are frequently given: one is that Israel is overborne with the burden of the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law, and the other that it is the load of sin that weighs upon Israel.[74] As Davies and Allison urge, both possibilities need to be taken into account.[75] The first is suggested by the use of the word "burden" (φορτίον) at both 11:30 and 23:4.[76] The latter passage condemns the scribes and Pharisees for binding heavy burdens on men's shoulders. As this is the only other verse in the gospel where burdens are explicitly mentioned, it is a reasonable inference to assume some connection.[77] The fact that 11:28-30 is immediately followed by a controversy with the Pharisees about plucking grain helps to substantiate the point.[78] Deutsch makes the attractive suggestion that Matthew is not so much opposed to Pharisaic legal interpretation as to the "Pharisees' lack of solidarity with the people who follow them."[79]

---

[72] Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 84; Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 41; Légasse, *Jésus et l'Enfant* (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 237; Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 219. Deutsch, in her more recent work (*Lady Wisdom*, 118), however, sees Jesus' invitation as "directed to the Pharisees' disciples."

[73] Following BAGD s.v. κοπιάω is translated here as "weary." The above two terms are best regarded as synonymous.

[74] See the extensive list of scholars cited by Jacques Dupont, *Les Béatitudes*, II *La Bonne Nouvelle* (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 193#3, who favour the first interpretation.

[75] DA II 287-89.

[76] 11:28 has the cognate form πεφορτισμένοι. Apart from Luke 11:46, which features both the verb and noun, these words do not occur elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels.

[77] "The burden is that of the halachic interpretation of these teachers" (Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 59).

[78] Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 89-93.

[79] Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 41.

The passage also suggests the burden of sin. Jesus comes to save his people from their sins (1:21). The people are weary and burdened with sin and sickness, a depiction that accords well with other descriptions of the crowds as scattered and helpless, plagued with numerous illnesses. It also accords with the portrayal of Jesus as the humble servant who cares for the helpless. Stanton has rightly emphasized that the wisdom elements of the passage have been subordinated to the depiction of Jesus as servant.[80] The description of Jesus as "gentle and lowly in heart" (11:29b) has marked affinities with the fulfilment citations in the gospel. The inclusion of Zechariah 9:9 in the narration of the Triumphal Entry establishes the triumph of Jesus' humility, and the same holds true with the citation of Isaiah 42:1-4 at 12:18-21. It is not Sophia who addresses the people so much as their servant-king.

What is most remarkable about 11:28-30, however, is the form of Jesus' invitation. The invitation to discipleship at 4:19 is prefaced by δεῦτε, just as it is here. In each case, the adverb serves as the basis of a divine call (cf. 22:3; 25:34) demanding an immediate response. Where the two passages differ profoundly, however, is in Jesus' requirements of the people. They are not charged to follow him or "come after" him (δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου 4:19 cf. 19:21) as the disciples are, but, rather, to come *to* him (δεῦτε πρός με). The focus is upon Jesus himself and not upon discipleship. They are invited to come to him for what he can do for them, as is evident from a consideration of the consequences of their actions. When the people assume the yoke of Christ (which many would understand as the Christ-mediated Torah) they also secure rest for themselves.[81] Rest is twice mentioned, and connotes, among other things, eschatological blessing.[82] As with the eschatological blessings of healing and the eschatological banquet, the people of Israel can partake of divine rest now,[83] and it is the possibility of acquiring rest that provides them with the motivation for accepting the invitation. While it remains paradoxical how the increased stringency of Jesus' interpretation of the Torah should be light and easy to bear, it is—whatever rationale may underlie the supposition—simply assumed by the evangelist to be the case.[84] The

---

[80] G. Stanton, "Comfortable Words?," 371-72. Contrast Christ, *Jesus Sophia* 119. Stanton's case is even stronger if 11:29b is, in fact, Matthean.

[81] For various understandings of the yoke, see Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 110-111.

[82] Betz, "Logion," 23; Légasse, *Jésus et l'Enfant*, 239.

[83] Betz, "Logion," 23; Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 41-42; Légasse, *Jésus et l'Enfant*, 242.

[84] For various explanations of this paradox, cf. DA II 291-92.

crowds are invited to become adherents so that they might be freed from weariness and labour.

Yet such a scenario is the very antithesis of that proposed by Stanton. Instead of experiencing the exertions and toils incumbent upon ministers of the gospel, the people are, *per contra*, to be freed from them. Instead of foregoing present benefits for eschatological blessings, the crowds are to experience the eschatological blessings in the present. Their acceptance of Jesus' offer would entail none of the sacrifice that Jesus has required from his disciples. Of course, like the disciples, they should bear the yoke of the Torah, but there is no suggestion of renunciation on their part, but of liberation. That is to say, being called to come to Jesus is to be categorically distinguished from being called to follow him. One is very clearly an invitation; the other is a command. In coming to Jesus, the crowds approach their Messiah and the blessings of the messianic age that he offers them.

G *Following and Miracles*

If the crowds are not called by Jesus to follow him, is it not the case, as Luz has queried, that the following of Jesus is nevertheless associated with his demonstrations of authority?[85] Are not the following of the crowds and miracles connected? Jesus' disciples certainly display a connection between the two, even though only one of the ten verses Luz cites, 8:23, Jesus' stilling of the storm, actually refers to the disciples.[86] The precise nature of the disciples' authority in the storm-stilling narrative is not immediately evident, but Bornkamm implies in his well-known study of the pericope that the disciples will be able to overcome "apocalyptic horrors" and, perhaps, subdue demonic powers.[87]

The connection is more prominent in the account of the walking on the water, a passage not included by Luz probably because it does not explicitly mention following. Yet it must be said that the idea underlies the whole account[88] and is linked with the stilling of the storm not only by theme, but also by the *Stichwort* "command" (κελεύω). In the stilling of the storm episode, Jesus commanded (ἐκέλευσεν) his disciples to follow him (8:18-19) just as, in a later episode at Peter's behest, "bid me" (κέλευσόν με), Jesus commands Peter to come to him on the water (14:28-29). The entire account is

[85] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.
[86] Luz cites 4:25; 8:1, 8:10; 8:23; 9:27; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 20:34.
[87] Bornkamm, *Tradition*, 56-57.
[88] Held, *Tradition*, 206; Segal, "Matthew's Jewish Voice," 9.

Matthean,[89] and Peter himself functions as a representative of the community as a whole.[90]

As was noted above, Jesus' command does more than merely summon Peter: it empowers him as well. Peter, in order to be able to walk to Jesus, must participate in Jesus' ἐξουσία. This is not to deny Peter his own initiative; the story obviously hinges on the fact that Peter's ability to do this rests on his own obedient faith and his willingness to have Jesus command him.[91] Yet he is, nevertheless, empowered by Jesus to do exactly what Jesus himself is doing. This whole scenario is redolent of the Mission discourse, where the ἐξουσία given to the disciples enables them to perform the same types of miracle that Jesus himself performs. In this regard, therefore, the empowerment of the disciple is related to the following of Jesus. The same authority that calls the disciples to a life of radical discipleship can empower the disciples to perform miracles: God has "given such authority to men"(9:8).

The following of the crowds is a different matter. A detailed examination of the passages adduced by Luz bears this out. All of the verses he appeals to (4:25; 8:1, 8:10; 8:23; 9:27; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 20:34) concern the crowds, except for the stilling of the storm episode (8:23-27).[92] Although Luz is quite correct to describe them as "miracle stories,"[93] his terminology can be sharpened even further since, again with the notable exception of 8:23-27, every one of the passages he lists is a healing. The crowds' following of Jesus does not result in their empowerment to perform wonders, but in their experience of healing. Most of the accounts of the crowds or supplicants following Jesus demonstrate a connection with healings. This can be seen with particular vividness in some of the editorial crowd passages:

12:15b
καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ [ὄχλοι] πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας

14:13b,14
καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων. 14 καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν

[89] Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, II 11. Strecker (*Weg*, 198-99) argues for an underlying piece of oral tradition based on the analogy with John 21:7, but his argument is hardly compelling.
[90] Strecker, *Weg*, 203-6.
[91] Of course, Peter ultimately begins to sink because of his little faith. Yet his ability to walk on the water at all is also central to the narrative.
[92] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.
[93] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.

τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.
19:2
καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ.

Each of these verses demonstrates extensive modification. In the case of 12:15, Matthew has compressed five verses of Mark into one of his own.[94] The behaviour of the crowd is reduced to one action: they "followed him" and so, too, is Jesus' response: "he healed them all." This encapsulation depicts the essence of their relationship—they follow and he heals them. The inclusion of πάντας only adds to this impression. While it demonstrates the absolute efficacy of Jesus' healing authority, it also has the related effect of displaying the absolute need of the crowds. Even if the healing only encompasses the sick of the crowds, the word implies that the entire group follows Jesus in order to be healed. As Gerhardsson aptly remarks of one of these passages, it "gives the impression that the crowd consists entirely of sick persons, coming to Jesus to receive from him what they seek: healing."[95]

That this is no coincidence is evident from a consideration of the next two passages. At 14:13-14 Matthew has added θεραπεύω and ἀκολουθέω to the account he adapts from Mark.[96] The verses he has changed are preparatory to the feeding of the five thousand and explain how Jesus and the crowds came to such a deserted locale. At the same time, the verses are designed to recreate a typical scene with Jesus and the crowds, analogous to the one Matthew has created at 15:29-31. Thus, the preamble to the feeding describes the crowds' wonted actions toward Jesus, and his customary response: he has pity on them and heals them. This pattern is unique to Matthew. In Mark, for instance, Jesus responds by teaching the crowds (Mark 6:34). Luke does show Jesus healing those who have need of it, but only after speaking to them about the Kingdom of God (Luke 9:11). In Matthew's account, however, the feeding functions as a continuation of healing. Jesus' compassion expresses itself in caring for the crowds' concrete physical needs.

At 19:2 Matthew has again introduced both θεραπεύω and ἀκολουθέω into his account. The parallel passage in Mark (Mark 10:1) has Jesus teaching the crowds when they "gathered to him again." As with 12:15, the αὐτούς gives the impression that all of the crowds are included within the scope of Jesus' healing activity.[97] Healing is con-

[94] Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 243.
[95] Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 26.
[96] On Matthew's redaction of Mark and the minor agreements at 14:13 with Luke 9:11, see DA II 478-80.
[97] Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 29.

sequent upon following Jesus. The same elements are evident at 4:24-5, although the order is reversed. The reason for this, however, is that the crowds have not previously been mentioned in the gospel. Verse 4:24, a verse unique to Matthew, is in all likelihood, designed not only to indicate part of the constitution of the crowds (all the sick, those afflicted with various diseases and pains, demoniacs, epileptics, paralytics as well as those who brought the sick), but also their grounds for following Jesus. Of course, Jesus' preaching and teaching are also prominent, but the chiastic arrangement of this passage is surely significant. Those mentioned in verse 24 are situated between two generalized references to Jesus' healing activity (4:23 "healing every disease and infirmity among the people;" and 4:25c "and he healed them"). The crowds' following is then alluded to in another, this time a geographical, reference to the constitution of the crowds. Once the correlation becomes established, the order of the terms is reversed.

The same feature is evident in the remaining three crowd passages, if not so immediately striking. All three (8:1; 8:10; 20:29) occur in the context of the healing of individuals who are not members of the crowds. In the healing of the centurion's servant (8:5-13), for instance, the centurion appears to approach Jesus when Jesus and the crowds enter Capernaum (8:5). At 20:29-34, the two blind men are seated at the side of the road as Jesus passes (20:30), while the leper appears to approach Jesus and the crowds as they descend from the mountain (8:1).

The healing accounts themselves differ in some respects from the summaries listed above. In the healing account at 20:29-34, the two blind men follow Jesus *after* they have been healed (20:34), just as happens with Bartimaeus in Mark (Mark 10:52). One likely reason for their inclusion in the crowd following Jesus is that they may thereby form part of the procession in the Triumphal Entry. As supplicants, they repeatedly called upon the Son of David to be healed of their blindness (20:30,31), and were healed by Jesus. It is fitting, therefore, that they should join the crowds and celebrate the arrival of the Son of David in Jerusalem. They are eyewitnesses, so to speak, of his compassion.

Taken as a whole, these factors are highly suggestive. In a few instances Matthew has simply associated healing and following, but in the remaining passages the healing of the crowds is related to their following of Jesus. The implication would seem to be that healing is one of the dominant motifs in the crowds' following of Jesus. Nor would one be remiss in saying it is one of their dominant motives. Naturally, the crowds' illnesses are not their only reason for following

Jesus. Clearly there are others, such as Jesus' teaching (and manner of teaching 7:28), his proclamation of the gospel, and perhaps even his feeding of the crowds (14:13-21; 15:32-39 cf. John 6:26). Nevertheless, just as healing predominates in the list of signs Jesus gives John the Baptist (11:5), one could say that a desire to be healed is a central motive for the crowds' following of Jesus. And he heals them not because of their implied discipleship, but because they are needy. The crowds follow Jesus, at least in part, in order to be healed. Hence, their actions are a consequence of the ministry, particularly the healing ministry, which Jesus has embarked upon in Israel.

Thus, the "following" of the crowds is largely supplicatory. They follow Jesus in order to be ministered to; they are sheep without a shepherd and they follow out of their need. The same cannot be said about the twelve disciples. They follow Jesus because he has commanded them to, and because they are able to help Jesus assuage the needs of the crowds. Just how different the two groups' situations are can be ascertained from a consideration of what following Jesus entails for the crowds and the disciples. For the former, their following of Jesus results in an experience of his compassion. He allays their suffering and heals their illnesses. He delivers them from their distress and restores them to a normal mode of existence.[98] For the disciples, however, the reverse is true. They are called from their normal mode of existence to one that, by its very nature, entails suffering. They have to forego their attachment to their families and take up their cross to follow Jesus. They experience persecution on his account as a matter of course, and give up everything to follow him. One could almost say that their starting point, as it were, a normal life with all its attachments (family, jobs), is the finishing point for those who are healed. The crowds resume the normal life that has been disrupted by illnesses.

Where the disciples do resemble the crowds is in their response to Jesus. Both the following of the disciples and that of the crowds can be regarded as a response to divine initiative, and this is the reason why the following of the two groups is so frequently correlated in the gospel. When Jesus begins his public ministry, both the disciples and crowds respond in characteristic fashion. The disciples "immediately" (4:20,22) follow when Jesus has summoned them to sacrificial discipleship, while the crowds' first action is to bring all their sick to him. Yet both are responses to the person of Jesus. Initiative on the

---

[98] Gerd Theissen (*Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992] 84) regards illness as a contributing factor to the social uprootedness of Jewish-Palestinian society.

disciples' part, if it exists at all, is certainly downplayed.[99] Similarly, the following of the crowds is not self-initiated discipleship, but a response to Jesus' divinely instituted, compassionate ministry to Israel (15:24). Their apparently spontaneous following of Jesus is actually a response to his willingness to requite their needs, an invitation seen all the more clearly at 11:28. The people need only come to him to obtain freedom from their burdens. The divine call, therefore, even if it is different for the crowds and the disciples, provides the ground for human responses. The two groups have this in common. The crowds "come to" Jesus while the disciples "follow after" him, but, either way, they respond to divine initiative.

In spite, then, of Matthew's use of the same word with reference to the disciples and the crowds, their response to divine initiative is virtually their only point in common. Otherwise, it is evident that the crowds are never expressly bidden to become disciples, in the sense that the twelve are disciples. In Matthew, the following of the crowds is not ecclesiological as Luz supposes,[100] but christological. Matthew is not at all concerned with discipleship in these instances, and it is a misnomer, therefore, to describe it as discipleship. Rather, Matthew is concerned with the portrait of Jesus, and has placed a great deal of emphasis in the gospel on Jesus as servant.[101] The healing accounts give content to this portrait. Held well observes that the healing stories in Matthew "do not show the thaumaturge who seeks to gain recognition and admiration through his deeds, but the servant of God as he works on behalf of the helpless."[102]

The ἀκολουθέω motif plays a vital part in this process because it is there to focus attention upon Jesus. The action of the crowds is directed solely toward Jesus, and by virtue of this, illumines his compassion and, at the same time, his majesty and authority. The crowds follow him not merely because he is well disposed towards them, but because of his power to act out of this disposition. Thus Matthew is able, through his conjunction of healing with following, to develop several facets of his understanding of Jesus as servant and Messiah. The crowds instinctively follow him because he, as their leader, can provide what their own leaders cannot. As a shepherd to the sheep of Israel, he provides them with rest and fulfilment of their needs.

---

[99] The parables of the Pearl and Hidden Treasure (13:44-46) may address the issue of individuals electing to follow Jesus, but even here the matter is far from clear.

[100] Luz, "Disciples," 124#64.

[101] For a careful discussion of the place of the servant in Matthew's Christology, see David Hill, "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology," *JSNT* 6 (1980) 2-16.

[102] Held, *Tradition*, 264.

H *Sheep and Shepherd*

If, as was just suggested, Matthew's use of ἀκολουθέω is christological, there is also a significant salvation-historical component to it. Two of the passages mentioned above—4:24-25 and 20:34—have the crowds follow Jesus after they have been healed. Given the programmatic importance of the first passage especially, the passages infer that healing is not the only reason that the crowds are described as following Jesus; there is probably a pastoral implication as well. Yet, at first sight, it might be queried whether the idea of following does, in fact, call to mind a shepherd and his flock, especially as there does not appear to be a particularly well-established correlation in the synoptic tradition. The verb ἀκολουθέω is not used in a pastoral context in the Synoptic Gospels, and where the image does occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, it is the leading of the shepherd and not the following of the flock that is emphasized. Nevertheless, following is implicit in the metaphor, since the shepherd is usually described as going before or guiding his flock. Thus the Psalmist declares to God: "Thou didst lead thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron" (Ps 77:20 ὡδήγησας ὡς πρόβατα τὸν λαόν σου [LXX 76:21]). So, too, in Psalm 23; "He leads me…" (Ps 23:2,3). The shepherd leads and the sheep are presumed to follow.

Despite these examples, one might conclude that the following of the flock is not a common motif in the scriptural tradition and one, therefore, unlikely to have been used by Matthew. Such would be the case if it did not occur with suggestive frequency in John's gospel, particularly in the description of Jesus as the good shepherd: "He goes before them, and the sheep follow him...but a stranger they will not follow."[103] Later in the chapter, Jesus states, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow (ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι) me" (John 10:27). Not only does John's gospel use ἀκολουθέω to describe the following of sheep, it also uses the term metaphorically. Whether this suggests direct dependence on the Synoptic Gospels is doubtful;[104] it more likely reflects a common tradition.[105]

---

[103] Cf. John 10:4b,5: ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ... ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν.

[104] M. Sabbe, "John 10 and its relationship to the Synoptic Gospels" in Beutler and Fortna, *Shepherd Discourse*, 75-93. Although Sabbe does not mention the motif of following, he does argue that the Shepherd discourse is dependent on the Synoptic Gospels (pp. 85-88).

[105] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2nd ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1978) 368. Against this view, cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) II 285.

Given the existence of these Johannine parallels, however, and the possibility of a common tradition, it is probable that the following of the crowds is conceived of as an element of Matthew's larger pastoral metaphor. John differs from Matthew in applying the metaphor to members of his community, even if it is true that his *aulê* (John 10:1) constitutes the Jewish people, as opposed to the Gentiles, "the other sheep that are not of this fold" (John 10:16). Where the accounts agree though, is in Jesus' care for his flock, and in the flock's recognition that Jesus will be able to provide for their wants.

The "following" motif, therefore, focusses attention on Jesus as the shepherd of the flock. The following of the crowds distinguishes Jesus as (to employ Johannine language) a good shepherd. His behaviour sets him apart from the bad shepherds who are blind guides (15:14; 23:16,24), and who lead their charges into a pit (15:14).[106] Instead of harming his flock, Jesus heals them, guides them, feeds them and gives them rest. As the Davidic shepherd, he tends the people of Israel, and they, in following him, are, for a time, no longer sheep without a shepherd. Jesus, therefore, fulfils the prophecy in Ezekiel where Yahweh declares, "I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them: he shall feed them and be their shepherd" (Ezek 34:23).[107] Jesus' relation to the crowds, therefore, and their following of him, is yet another instance of fulfilled prophecy in Matthew. While by no means as obvious as the gospel's fulfilment-citations, the following of the crowds serves as another instance where Matthew demonstrates that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah.

The following of the crowds also relates closely to the "gathering" motif. While the motif of the shepherd "gathering" his flock is conspicuously lacking in the first gospel, its absence actually contributes to Matthew's exalted depiction of Christ. Like the shepherd in the parable of the lost sheep, Jesus has, to a certain degree, sought out the sheep that have gone astray (cf. 9:12-13). Yet, with the crowds he does not need to do so. They seek him out. Matthew is able to emphasize the majesty of Jesus through having the

---

[106] It is noteworthy that the bad shepherds in John are generally regarded as Pharisaic as well.

[107] The role of the disciples corroborates this prophetic depiction. They figure as his coworkers, as the promised shepherds who were prophesied in Jeremiah. (Jer 23:4) They help to tend the flock, and have been empowered to do so. Their following of Jesus is emblematic of their authority to minister to the crowds and to perform what Jesus has required of them. Even when the image of sheep is applied to the disciples at 10:16, they are "sent out" amongst the wolves; they go to minister, not to be ministered to.

flock "gather itself" to Jesus and follow him. Unlike Luke and Mark, who both introduce the crowds without much explanation,[108] Matthew begins at 4:23 by enumerating their provenance in detail. Their dispersal is patent: they come from areas as widespread as the Decapolis, Judaea, Galilee, and the Transjordan—territories representative of the Davidic kingdom.[109] Yet, in response to his healing they assemble and form the audience for the Sermon on the Mount. The advent of Jesus is the catalyst that brings them all together in one massed group. Jesus' person has effected the gathering together of the scattered flock of Israel, even if he has not overtly summoned them. The gathering process, therefore, is employed by Matthew as the precise antithesis of the dispersal of the flock that ensues when a shepherd is removed (26:31 // Zech 13:7). Where the scattering of the sheep once indicated that they were without a shepherd, their flocking together now demonstrates that they are "sheep with a shepherd," a shepherd whom they follow.

Their assembling from all Israel has a significant correspondence with the behaviour of Israel at the inception of David's rule. At the outset of David's reign, "all the tribes of Israel came to David at Hebron" to acknowledge God's choice of David as "shepherd of my people Israel" (2 Sam 5:1-2). In the same way, the crowds follow Jesus to Jerusalem and proclaim him the Son of David (21:11). Matthew's repeated description of the following of the crowds, especially at the Triumphal Entry, is meant to suggest a king and his people—the Son of David is united with the rank and file of Israel and acclaimed by them.

In sum, the following motif is used of the crowds to show that, like the disciples, they also have a definite relationship to Jesus. It is not that of disciple and master, but of subject and king. This too helps to explain the prominence of the following motif in relation to the crowds. Matthew has the crowds follow Jesus to disclose both his royal status and his subjects' dependence upon him as the source of their salvation. As suggested above, at 11:28 Jesus invites all of his subjects to come to him and experience rest for their souls. His ministry to them—his healing, teaching, feeding—are constitutive of his role as humble king, and as the shepherd of his people. The precise nature of his kingly status will be the subject of the next chapter.

---

[108] Luke 3:10 (Q); Mark first introduces the crowd by name at 2:4, but the presence of different crowds is evident as early as 1:21; cf. 1:32-34, 43.

[109] If the Decapolis is indeed viewed as part of the Davidic kingdom as argued above, in Chapter Three.

I *Conclusion*

The import of the verb ἀκολουθέω in the gospel of Matthew is ecclesiological, christological, and salvation-historical. For the disciples it is ecclesiological insofar as the following of the disciples establishes a blueprint for the followers of Jesus. For them following Jesus is to be a sacrificial renunciation of their own lives and concerns. As members of Jesus' symbolic family they perform the will of God, and are empowered by Jesus to engage in the ministry to which he has called them.

The following of the disciples is christological in that the disciples' calling is entirely dependent on the call and the person of Jesus. Jesus empowers them to act as his representatives (cf. 10:1-5) and serves as the ultimate source of their miraculous authority. Moreover, it is Jesus' own ministry that serves as the paradigm for the activity of his disciples. Like Paul (1 Co 11:1), they become μιμηταί of Christ and his ministry.

The following of the crowds is also christological. They draw attention to Jesus and the character of his ministry. As the lost sheep of the House of Israel, they function as a foil not only to his compassion but also to his ἐξουσία. He alone is able to bear their illnesses, and this is why the crowds flock to him. At the same time, their following does not indicate a "qualitative allegiance" to Jesus, but a fundamental need. The repeated occurrence of ἀκολουθέω with θεραπεύω suggests that Matthew's intention is to bring this need to the fore so that he can at the same time stress Jesus' (and the disciples') compassion in caring for their ills. The ἀκολουθέω motif, therefore, is simply an outworking of the θεραπεύω theme discussed in an earlier chapter, and demonstrates how central a theme healing is for Matthew's understanding of Jesus.

Finally, the following of the crowds is *heilsgeschichtlich*. Their following of Jesus, and their spontaneous gathering to him mark Jesus as their awaited king, the Son of David. The crowds turn to him as needy subjects who instinctively recognize their long-awaited ruler. The crowds' following of Jesus marks a new phase of salvation history. The following of the people of Israel, and Jesus' healing of them is a harbinger of the messianic age.

Thus, the depiction of the crowds as needy and burdened fits well with the portrayal of Jesus' ministry. The people of Israel, in distinction to their leaders, are especially in want of healing. Their following Jesus simply gives expression that need. Jesus' one explicit invitation to the people as a whole (11:28-30) corroborates this impression. They are destitute, and he, as their king invites them to

come to him so that he might assuage their need and shepherd them into the messianic age. The crowds' instinctive gravitation to Jesus, therefore, implicitly reveals the relationship between the crowds and Jesus. Their following of Jesus identifies him as their shepherd king, the Son of David. He is their rightful king and they are his rightful—if needy—subjects.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER EIGHT

A <u>*A*</u> *Son of David?*

Given the fact that the crowds twice mention the "Son of David" (12:23; 21:9), it is obvious that a proper appreciation of the title is necessary for a proper appreciation of the crowds. Since Matthew's deployment of the title is considerable,[1] and continues to engender debate, it will be worth exploring the use of the appellation in the gospel before examining its specific reference to the crowds.

The first question to settle is whether one should distinguish between the title "Son of David" when it appears with an article and the anarthrous "Son of David."[2] Suhl, for one, has argued that there is a far-reaching distinction between the two. He claims that the occurrence of the title with article betrays a "false messianic understanding."[3] By contrast, he regards the use of the appellation without the article is typical of the suppliants whom Jesus commends for their faith.

Although Suhl's approach is attractive at first glance, several factors weigh against it. The first is the extent to which a distinction actually exists between the two forms. It is possible that υἱὸς Δαυίδ is anarthrous at Matthew 9:27 and 20:30,31 under the influence of the Hebrew construct state.[4] Certainty about the matter is difficult, however, because it is difficult to gauge the extent to which these passages are semitized.[5] If they do, in fact, reflect the influence of the construct state, then the variation between the arthrous and anarthrous titles is simply a difference in form, rather than one that is theologically motivated.[6]

---

1 "Son of David" occurs nine times in Matthew (1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30; 20:31; 21:9; 21:15) versus three times in Mark (10:47; 10:48; 12:35), three times in Luke (18:38; 18:39 and 20:41), and none in Q.

2 The above discussion concentrates on the use of the title with reference to Jesus. At 1:20 Joseph is also described as son of David.

3 Suhl, "Davidssohn,"73: "falsches Messiasverständnis."

4 Moulton, *Grammar*, III 34; cf. BDF 147(3).

5 Duling, "Therapeutic,"400. The *Vorlage* for both pericopae is Mark 10:48, where the best texts have υἱὲ Δαυίδ. A number of sources, however, have υἱὸς: DK f^{13} 565 *pc* or ὁ υἱὸς: A W f^{1}.

6 W. R. G. Loader ("Son of David, Blindness, Possession and Duality in Matthew," *CBQ* (1982) 571#4) finds a related phenomenon with the use of the appellation Son of God.

More problematic with Suhl's approach is the stance he is forced to assume regarding the children who praise Jesus' healings at 21:15. Because the children use the articular appellation (Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ), Suhl has to range them with those who possess a false understanding of the Messiah.[7] Yet, such an appreciation of their outburst is hardly consistent with the overall tenor of the gospel (11:25), nor, significantly, is it consistent with Jesus' own acceptance of the praise at 21:16. Suhl attempts to discount Jesus' approbation by claiming that Jesus acknowledges only the fact of their acclaim and not its substance.[8] He overlooks, however, the fact that Jesus' quotation of Psalm 8 expresses a definite opinion about the children's utterance—it is "perfect praise."[9] For both of the above reasons, therefore, Suhl's argument does not hold. In Matthew's gospel, there is no evident distinction between "Son of David" with and without the definite article.

B *Son of David as a Messianic Title?*[10]

If the above two forms of the title are similar, how is it to be understood? Is it, as Trilling advocates, the only unambiguously messianic title employed by Matthew or something rather less?[11] The question does not admit of easy answers, as Matthew's portrayal does not appear monolithic to say the least.[12] On the one hand, the gospel refers to Jesus as the Son of David some eight times, and its genealogy

---

[7] Suhl, "Davidssohn," 73.
[8] Suhl, "Davidssohn," 73#42.
[9] As Barnabas Lindars (*New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* [London: SCM, 1961] 168) observes: "Though the Jewish authorities refused to acknowledge the kingship of Jesus, the "babes" celebrated his arrival in accordance with prophecy. The acclamation of the common people is taken as evidence of the rightness of the Church's claim about Jesus, because it is they whom the psalm especially mentions as destined to acclaim the Christ. For a similar point, see Burger, *Davidssohn*, 80-81#37 and W. Trilling, "Der Einzug in Jerusalem: Mt 21, 1-17" in J. Blinzler et al. (eds.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963) 307.
[10] I follow Gerbern S. Oegema (*The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 26) in defining the Messiah as a "priestly, royal or otherwise characterized figure, who will play a liberating role at the end of time." Oegema proposes thirteen criteria for establishing the messianic character of texts (p. 31).
[11] Trilling ("Einzug," 305) accounts it "der von Matthäus *einzig* eindeutig messianisch verstandene Titel Jesu (ausser eben χρίστος selbst)."
[12] Stanton ("Origin," 1923) fittingly remarks that "Matthew's use of this title remains something of an enigma."

emphasizes the kingship of Jesus and his place in David's royal line.[13] On the other hand, a substantial number of passages stress the role of Son of David as healer. The disciples do not use the title of Jesus, nor is it one of Jesus' self-appellations. The title is confined to Jesus' earthly ministry, and even then, to delimited groups.[14]

Because of these anomolous features, some scholars have sought to impugn the importance of the title. Raymond Brown, for one has deemed it a "correct but inadequate title of the Jesus of the Matthean ministry."[15] Others have suggested that the title Son of David is subordinate to other christological titles. With respect to the genealogy, for instance, it has been argued that the "Son of David concept needs to be set in relation to the Son of God motif,"[16] and, further, that the Son of David controversy (22:41-46) reveals that Jesus Messiah is greater than Jesus Son of David.[17] The following discussion will evaluate these arguments, beginning with the genealogy and then the Son of David controversy.

Kingsbury and R. Pesch argue that the account of the virginal conception of Jesus (1:18,20) gives particular prominence to Jesus *qua* Son of God over Jesus Son of David. That Jesus is implicitly the Son of God, is made evident by the ἐγεννήθη at 1:16, and through the virginal conception by the Holy Spirit.[18]

The problem with such an interpretation is that it subordinates something that is explicit in the text, to something that is largely latent. The term "Son of God" nowhere occurs in chapter one, while "Son of David" occurs twice (1:1; 1:20 of Joseph) and David himself is mentioned four additional times (1:6*bis*; 1:17*bis*). Nor does such an argument account for the prominence given to the title Son of David at the incipit of the gospel: Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ.[19]

---

[13] 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30,31; 21:9,15; cf. 22:42,43,45 (Son of David controversy) and 1:20 (Joseph).

[14] See Jack D. Kingsbury ("Son of David," 593), who also points out that the title does not occur in the death or resurrection narratives.

[15] Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (2nd Ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993) 134.

[16] A. D. A. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy* (JSNTSup 122; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 195-97. Moses draws on arguments propounded by Kingsbury ("Son of David," 591-602) and R. Pesch ("Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate," *Bib* 48 (1967) 411, 416).

[17] Kingsbury, "Son of David," 596; Moses, *Transfiguration Story*, 199-201.

[18] Kingsbury, "Son of David," 594; R. Pesch, "Gottessohn," 411, 416.

[19] Both Marshall Johnson (*The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* [2nd Ed.; SNTSMS 8; Cambridge: University Press, 1988] 225) and Pesch ("Der Gottessohn," 416) regard this as a reworking of Mark 1:1.

Matthew is the only one of the evangelists expressly to designate Jesus as Son of David, and by situating the title at 1:1, Matthew has given Son of David an undoubted primacy.[20] As Davies has justly remarked, the "very first name after Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1:1 is David."[21] The incipit clearly places the appellation Son of David and its related christological elements[22] in an emphatic position with respect to the rest of the gospel. The title is further emphasized, at least implictly, by the fact that David alone is expressly designated as τὸν βασιλέα (1:6),[23] a title itself not without significance in Matthew.[24] The force of it designates Jesus as the eschatological renewer of the Davidic kingdom, and thereby as the culminating point of Israel's history.[25]

Kingsbury's argument that "Matthew makes no reference to the term Son of God in 1:1 because . . . he desires that God himself should be the first one to pronounce this title openly, in the climactic baptismal scene" is unconvincing.[26] The effect would surely be more profound if God's testimony in the narrative itself were seen to agree with that of the narrator at 1:1. That υἱὸς Δαυίδ occurs in the mouth of the angel of the Lord (ἄγγελος κυρίου) when he addresses Joseph at 1:20 would again stress its appropriateness as a fitting title for Jesus.[27] Given the context, the angel of the Lord must be regarded as a reliable narrator. The angel speaks to Joseph on behalf of God himself. Taken together, these features put a different complexion on the above arguments. The evangelist and angels use the title even if

---

[20] This is well brought out by David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973) 116.

[21] Davies, "Matthew's Messianism," 500.

[22] A. Vögtle (*Messias und Gottessohn*, 18) identifies three christological strands here. Cf. David R. Bauer, "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel" in Bauer and Powell, *Treasures*, 141.

[23] Cf. K. Stendahl, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Matthew 1-2" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 60, who remarks that "in 1:6 the royal status of David, and only of David, is stressed." The name of David assumes additional importance if the gematria on David (דוד 4 + 6 + 4 = 14) is assumed to underlie the scheme of 3 x 14 generations mentioned at 1:17. On this, see Davies, "Matthew's Messianism," 499; Schweizer, *Gemeinde*, 17#36.

[24] Reginald Fuller (*The Foundations of New Testament Christology* [London: Lutterworth Press, 1965] 191) observes that "the title ὁ χριστός ("the Christ") and ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ("the King of the Jews") seem to be here [sc. 2:1-12] (uniquely) used as equivalent for the Davidic sonship." It is also likely that the title at 27:11 reflects the Son of David, and it is certainly true of 21:5.

[25] Siegfried Schulz, *Die Stunde der Botschaft: Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten* (Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1970) 198.

[26] Kingsbury, "Son of David," 594.

[27] Cf. Johnson, *Genealogies*, 218. Of course, the angel is applying the title to Joseph in this particular passage.

Jesus and the disciples do not. And, while Matthew is doubtless alluding to Jesus' divine sonship in the chapter, it is surely a considerable misreading of the text to claim that this implicit reference necessarily eclipses the Davidic themes that are expressly and repeatedly mentioned.[28]

The second objection noted above concerned the insufficiency of the appellation Son of David in Jesus' debate with the Pharisees (22:41-46). Various reasons for regarding the title as insufficient have been adduced. Gibbs maintains that the position of the pericope relative to all the other Son of David pericopae provides an indication of the title's inadequacy.[29] He further argues that Jesus' argument is calculated to discredit "the Pharisees' notion of Messiahship *as determined* by sonship to David 'according to the flesh', rather than by the divine sonship, or unique spiritual relation to God—which was to Jesus the basis of his own messianic vocation."[30]

Finally, Kingsbury has sought to argue that the passage is primarily concerned with the title "Son of God." Matthew's real point, he suggests, is that "if David, in calling the Messiah 'Lord', has himself acknowledged in scripture [Psalm 110] that the Messiah is of higher station than he (viz., one exalted by God to the right hand of power), then the Messiah cannot be regarded as the 'Pharisees' view him, viz., as simply the Son of David … but … the Son of God; for in terms of sonship, it is the latter that surpasses the former."[31] Kingsbury further claims that κύριος is subordinated to other christological terms in Matthew. Since "it basically refers beyond itself to some other, more definitive title, it is most properly to be regarded in the First Gospel not as one of the chief titles with which Matthew develops his christology (or indeed the primary one), but as an auxiliary christological title."[32]

Gibbs' argument about the placement of the pericope in the gospel is tenuous. Is it likely that Matthew would be disposed (after 22 chapters) to reverse suddenly a position he himself had sanctioned at the outset of the gospel? It makes far better sense to suppose that Matthew continues to use the title in a manner consonant with all the other occurrences of the term in the gospel.[33] Further, Gibbs' second

---

[28] John Nolland ("No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25," *JSNT* 62 (1996) 3-12) slightly overstates the converse position.

[29] Gibbs, "Purpose," 461.

[30] Gibbs ("Purpose," 460-461), who is relying on J. Vernon Bartlett, *The Gospel of St. Mark* (The Century Bible; Edinburgh: 1922) 287-8; italics his.

[31] Kingsbury, "Son of David," 596.

[32] Kingsbury, "Title," 255.

[33] Strecker, *Weg*, 119; cf. Sand, *Gesetz*, 148.

argument fails to take cognizance of the seemingly "inconspicuous" but, ultimately, very considerable changes Matthew has wrought in his account.[34] In Mark, the Son of David Christology is attacked, but in Matthew, the reverse is the case. Matthew is not intent upon discrediting sonship "according to the flesh" but, rather, in accrediting it. This is arguably the whole point of 1:20—to legitimize the Son of David according to the flesh through adoption. As Tatum has recognized, "Jesus becomes 'Son of David' (1:1)... because he is adopted by Joseph 'Son of David' (1:20)."[35] Gibbs has failed to perceive this, in part, because he bases his analysis on a framework derived from Mark's version of the pericope.[36]

Gibbs also fails to note that there is a considerable intensification of κύριος in Matthew's account. The evangelist anticipates the citation of the Psalm 110 by introducing κύριος at 21:43,[37] the effect of which is to focus attention not only on the issue of sonship, but also on the significance of κύριος. As the term occurs three times within the space of six words (κύριον λέγων, εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου) a reader only misses the emphasis with difficulty.

There are two problems with Kingsbury's analysis. The first is that he discounts the complementary nature of Matthew's christological terminology in favour of a rigidly hierarchical schema.[38] He assumes as a matter of course that in the gospel there will be one title that is pre-eminent instead of recognizing that it is through a multiplicity of complementary appellations that Matthew develops his distinctive Christology.[39] It is possible that Son of God is alluded to here, but even if it were, it would still best be taken as relational.[40]

The second problem is that there is no need to import the title Son of God into the passage. Since Matthew accords prominence to

---

[34] For a detailed account of what he describes as "inconspicuous" changes, see Burger, *Davidssohn*, 88-89.

[35] See W. Barnes Tatum, "The Origin of Jesus Messiah (Matt. 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions," *JBL* 96 (1977) 531.

[36] Gibbs' argument is derived from Bartlett's comments on Mark's version of the account. The "Son of David" (22:41-46) pericope will be considered more fully below.

[37] Burger, *Davidssohn*, 89.

[38] It is evident that a hierarchical schema is also presupposed in Kingsbury's discussion of the Son of David in Matthew's genealogy.

[39] Hill, "Son and Servant," 2-16; Brian M. Nolan (*The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* [OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979] 183; Riches, *Matthew*, 91-2; Senior, *Matthew*, 56-7; Stanton, "Origin," 1924.

[40] One need only refer to the concatenation of titles at 1:1 for a similar instance of a "relational" approach—Matthew gives no indication here of a "pre-eminent" title.

κύριος both at 22:41-46, and elsewhere in his gospel, it is preferable to understand the two titles to which he has given emphasis relationally, without having recourse to a third (unmentioned) title—namely Son of God. David Daube's approach has noted the passage's similarity in form to the rabbinic category of haggadah, which treated various apparent contradictions in scripture by making a distinction.[41] With respect to 22:41-46, he suggests that "the answer implied is not that one notion is right and the other wrong, but that both are right in different contexts."[42] The precise parameters of these contexts have been interpreted in various ways,[43] but the tension between the two titles is best described in terms of audience. The pericope discloses two complementary facets to Jesus: a Son of David sent to Israel on the one hand, and an authoritative lord sent to all peoples. While Son of David reflects Jesus' particular calling to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," Jesus as Lord relates to his universal dominion over Jews and Gentiles alike.

C *The Royal Son of David*

The title's prominence in Matthew's genealogy would strongly suggest that Matthew is drawing upon established traditions. What has prompted discussion is the extent of his indebtedness to these traditions. While the promises to David occur with some frequency in the Hebrew Scriptures and elsewhere, the traditions concerning the title "Son of David" itself are very limited. Nor, is it apparent to what extent Matthew's employment of the title is governed by tradition, and to what extent it is innovative.[44]

---

[41] David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: The Athlone Press, 1956) 158-159, 163.

[42] Daube, *Rabbinic*, 163 speaking of both Mark and Matthew. Cf. DA III 255.

[43] Daube suggests "he is David's son according to the flesh, but his Lord according to the spirit," *Rabbinic*, 163. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation," 33, suggests "in his earthly lowliness he is David's son, but as the Exalted One he is Lord." Strecker, *Weg*, 120 speaks of a theological "gleichzeitiges Nebeneinander," and is followed by Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 169#53), who prefers to speak of a "theologisch-literarisches Ineinander." Strecker's view seems most promising in seeing the distinction as a "Nebeneinander". The distinction between the two titles is best described in terms of a healing-servant Son of David sent to Israel on the one hand, and an authoritative lord sent to all people.

[44] A number of scholars maintain that Matthew's portrait differed from the common expectation of the Son of David. Leonhard Goppelt (*Theology of the New Testament*, II 220) remarks that what Matthew says "about the Son of David was not what Judaism was expecting in regard to *ben-dawid*." See further, Burger, *Davidssohn*, 44; Gundry, *Matthew*, 231; Lohse, "υἱός," 490.

As is well known, the expectation of a Davidic Messiah arose out of the promises to David in the Hebrew Bible (esp. 2 Sam 7:12-14, 25; 1 Kings 9:5; Psalm 89:3-4; Is 9:6-7; 11:1; Jer 23:5; 33:15; Amos 9:11),[45] and underwent various transmutations in intertestamental Judaism, emerging most vividly in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon (17:21-27).[46] The Psalm is the first document to identify the "Son of David" as the Messiah, and it specifically recurs to the promises made to David: "Lord, you chose David to be king over Israel, and swore to him about his descendants forever, that his kingdom should not fail before you" (PsSol 17:4). The Psalmist goes on to relate how the throne of David had been despoiled and how interlopers had insinuated themselves on the throne, but had been punished by God (PsSol 17:5-10).[47] The author ultimately looks to a future Davidid to restore God's people. He will intervene to rescue his people and punish the guilty:

> See, Lord, and raise up for them their king,
> The son of David, to rule over your servant Israel
> In the time known to you, O God
> Undergird him with the strength to destroy the unrighteous
> rulers, To purge Jerusalem from gentiles
> Who trample her to destruction;
> In wisdom and righteousness to drive out
> The sinners from the inheritance;
> To smash the arrogance of sinners like a potter's jar

---

[45] The most thoroughgoing analyses of the Davidic traditions are by Kenneth Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) and William M. Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1-17* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). Schniedewind demonstrates that Pomykala underestimates the influence of the Davidic promises. See, in addition: J. Fitzmyer, "The Son of David Tradition and Matt. 22.41-46 and Parallels," *Concilium* 10 (1966) 41-43; D. Verseput, "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity" in E. H. Lovering (ed.), *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 103-7.

[46] J. H. Charlesworth has sought to discredit the Pharisaic provenance of the Psalms. See, especially, his review of J. Schüpphaus' *Die Psalmen Salomos: Eine Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7, Leiden: Brill, 1977) in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50 (1982) 292-3. Recent opinion, however, (Schüpphaus included) has tended to regard the Psalms as Pharisaic; see: Oegama, *Anointed*, 104; Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty*, 160; Schniedewind, *David*, 154-54.

[47] As John J. Collins (*Scepter*, 50-53) has shown, it is probable that the Hasmoneans are being referred to.

(17.21 ἰδέ κύριε καὶ ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν υἱὸν Δαυιδ εἰς τὸν καιρόν ὃν εἵλου σύ ὁ θεός τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ Ισραηλ παῖδά σου 17.22 καὶ ὑπόζωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχὺν τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους καθαρίσαι Ιερουσαλημ ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν καταπατούντων ἐν ἀπωλείᾳ 17.23 ἐν σοφίᾳ δικαιοσύνης ἐξῶσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπὸ κληρονομίας ἐκτρῖψαι ὑπερηφανίαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ ὡς σκεύη κεραμέως)

This passage has certain affinities with Matthew. Both emphasize Davidic descent, and designate the Son of David as king (τὸν βασιλέα 1:6; PsSol 17:21). Just as clearly, however, Matthew's Son of David departs profoundly from the psalm's triumphalist conception of the Son of David. In fact, when other features of Matthew's Jesus are compared with the psalm's portrayal, the two emerge as virtual antinomies. Matthew's Son of David does not come to smash with an iron rod (PsSal 17:26); rather "he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smouldering wick" (12:20).[48] He does not purge the Gentiles or destroy them with the word of his mouth (PsSol 17:22,24)—instead he heals them (15:21-28), proclaims justice to them and gives them cause to hope; (12:18, 21). Instead of driving out sinners (PsSol 17:23), he associates with them, advocating "mercy instead of sacrifice" (9:11-13; 12:7).[49] Matthew has established Jesus as a scion of David and a king, but it is a humble not a conquering king he describes (21:5).

This last feature emerges with particular vividness in Matthew's version of the Triumphal Entry. Matthew's version of the entry, as distinguished from Mark's, reveals a deliberate downplaying of royalty. Matthew omits, for instance, Mark's mention of ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ (Mark 11:10), an omission which serves to eliminate any possible misunderstandings about the nature of his kingship.[50] Jesus is πραΰς—a quality conveyed by Matthew's mixed *Reflexionszitat* (Isa 62:11; Zech 9:9), which characterizes Jesus as a humble king.[51] Matthew is the only synoptic evangelist to cite

---

[48] The contrasting use of συντρίβω at PsSal 17:26 and Matt 12:20 is particularly arresting.

[49] The cry ἐλέησον is found four times with Son of David (in therapeutic contexts) and only once elsewhere in the gospel.

[50] Trilling, "Einzug," 303#2.

[51] See Hermann Patsch, "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem," *ZTK* 68 (1976) 10-11; Franz Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO 2; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1973) 103; Trilling, "Einzug," 304-305.

Zechariah 9:9 explicitly, and he has altered the passage precisely to bring Jesus' humility to the fore.[52] Jesus comes not as a political king on a war-horse, but as a humble king mounted on an ass and the foal of an ass.

The same theme is developed in Jesus' entry into the temple itself, where he heals the blind and the lame. Matthew's account has marked affinities with 2 Samuel 5:8, where a convoluted etiology is provided to explain the maxim "The blind and the lame shall not come into the house."[53] Part of the etiology refers to the "lame and blind, who are hated by David's soul." McCarter has argued that David does not want Jerusalem's inhabitants, the Jebusites, to be maimed or blinded by his mercenaries, but to be killed outright.[54] This is but one of several solutions he mentions, and it is far from certain precisely how Matthew would have understood the passage. It is most probable, however, that he would have seen the blind and the lame as Jebusites ranged against David and his troop. This is what the LXX has—ὅτι ἀντέστησαν οἱ τυφλοὶ καὶ οἱ χωλοί λέγοντες ὅτι οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται Δαυιδ ὧδε—and is the interpretation furnished by Josephus (*Ant.* 7.61).

With either interpretation, however, Matthew's portrayal of the Son of David differs markedly from that of David in 2 Samuel. Jesus does not come as a military conqueror, and the lame and the blind are emphatically not hated by his soul. His only act of violence is directed against the misuse of the temple cult by the authorities. The blind and lame instinctively flock to him in the temple to be healed. Matthew has inverted—and subverted—the entire episode from 2 Samuel to stress the humility and compassion of the Son of David. If, therefore, David's mantle is assumed by the Son of David, it is in a very different form from that of his progenitor. Matthew's Son of David is not a military conqueror, but a humble healer.

D *The Therapeutic Son of David*

The sphere where Matthew most often uses the title "Son of David" is a therapeutic one. Within the gospel most of the references to the Son of David occur within this context. In the mouths of the crowds (12:23; 21:9), children (21:15) or suppliants (9:27; 15:22; 20:30,31),

---

[52] Matthew has omitted δίκαιος καὶ σῴζων αὐτός to give prominence to the term πραΰς.

[53] On the ritual exclusion of the blind and lame from the temple, cf. Lev 21:18-19; mHag 1:1; and from the Congregation, cf. 1QSa 2:5-22; CD 15:15-17.

[54] P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel* (AB 9; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984) 135-40.

the title is invariably associated with healing.[55] While the prevalence of the motif within the gospel has frequently been commented upon,[56] it is less evident how the Son of David came to be associated with healing. In Mark this association is made once in Bartimaeus' supplication—"Jesus, Son of David (υἱὲ Δαυὶδ), have mercy on me"—just prior to the Triumphal Entry (Mark 10:48). Yet, the title in Mark is probably introduced here not because of its therapeutic associations, but to foreshadow the entry of the Son of David into Jerusalem.[57] Nevertheless, some scholars regard Matthew's therapeutic Son of David as a feature that he has appropriated entirely from Mark, with little reliance on established Jewish traditions.[58] Is Matthew simply expanding upon Mark or is he drawing upon common traditions?

The latter alternative is certainly possible. By the turn of the Common Era, David had come to be associated with exorcism,[59] as did, more notoriously, his son Solomon. Indeed, the reputation of Solomon as an exorcist appears to have been particularly well established. The incipit to the *Testament of Solomon* reads: "Testament of Solomon, Son of David, who reigned in Jerusalem, and subdued all the spirits of the air, of the earth, and under the earth." The work goes on to provide a number of colourful accounts of Solomon subduing demons, constraining them, among other things, to work on the construction of the temple.[60] Josephus also elaborates on Solomon's exorcistic ability as well as its therapeutic consequences: "And God granted him knowledge of the art used against demons for the benefit and healing (τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν) of men. He also composed incantations by which illnesses (τὰ νοσήματα) are relieved, and left behind forms of exorcisms with which those

---

[55] This assumes that the crowd's use of the title at 21:9 is an indirect response to the healing of the blind men 20:29-34, the crowd having taken over the blind men's use of the title. Apart from 20:29-34 (based on Mark's Bartimaeus account: Mark 10:46-52, cf. 47, 48), all the remaining *Stellen* are Matthean. Cf. Burger, *Davidssohn*, 90.

[56] Burger, *Davidssohn*, 90, 170; Duling, "Therapeutic," 407; Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 78-79.

[57] Loader, "Son of David," 571; cf. Hooker, *Saint Mark*, 253. By contrast, J. H. Charlesworth ("The Son of David: Solomon and Jesus" in P. Borgen and S. Giverson (eds.), *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism* [Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1995] 87) proposes a connection with the Solomon traditions mentioned below.

[58] Burger, *Davidssohn*, 79. France (*Matthew*, 286) suggests that Matthew associates the deeds of the Messiah with the Son of David precisely because they were not a feature of Jewish expectation.

[59] Pseudo-Philo, *LAB* 60.1; Josephus, *Ant.* 6.166-69; 11Q11 col 4; 11Q5 col 27.

[60] The *Testament* probably dates from a period somewhere between the first and third centuries of the Common Era; cf. *HJP* III 373-4.

possessed by demons drive them out never to return" (*Ant.* 8:45). According to Josephus, Solomon's power originated with God, and his nostrums for exorcism were so efficacious that they continued to work in Josephus' own day.[61]

Given such a pronounced correlation between exorcism and Solomon, the Son of David, it is natural to suppose that this tradition underlies Matthew's identification of Jesus as the Son of David. Twelftree, for instance, drawing on the evidence of the *Testament of Solomon*, claims that Matthew's innovative use of the title came about because it was "the one available messianic title that had strong healing connotations."[62] Others have argued along similar lines.[63]

Several problems beset such an interpretation, however. The chief difficulty is that, while it explains Jesus' exorcisms, it hardly does justice to all of Jesus' therapeutic activity. To be sure, Josephus uses the word θεραπεία in connection with Solomon's exorcisms, but the kind of healing he envisions, as the context makes evident, is the healing that results from an exorcism. And while there is no denying that in the time of Jesus demons were associated with a variety of ailments,[64] many of Jesus' healings were not in any way exorcistic. His healing of the lame and maimed, cleansing of lepers, and raising of the dead are all relatively free of such connotations. It may well be that Matthew has elaborated on Jesus' exorcistic ability and transmuted it into a broader therapeutic gift, but it is puzzling why he should do so.[65] It is especially puzzling given the fact that it is often held that Matthew has sought to downplay the overtly magical features present in his sources, particularly those in Mark.[66] Matthew's omissions of Mark 7:32-37 and 8:22-26 are often

[61] Cf. *Ant.* 8.45-49, where Josephus recounts how he, Vespasian and others had witnessed an exorcism performed by a "certain Eleazar," who, following Solomon's precepts, drew a demon out of a possessed man's nostrils. For other sources dealing with exorcisms, cf. 11Q11 col 1.

[62] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 184.

[63] See Klaus Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments," *NTS* 20 (1974), 3-9; Broer, "Christologie," 1261; DA III 718; Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 84-85; Loren R. Fisher, "Can This be the Son of David?" in Trotter, *Historian*, 82-97; and, recently, Moses (*Transfiguration Story*, 197-98), who maintains that Matthew's use of the title 'Son of David' is more 'Solomonic' than 'Davidic.'

[64] The Qumran document 4Q560, for instance, cites the "male Wasting-demon and the female Wasting-demon" as well as the Fever-demon, Chills-demon and Chest Pain-demon.

[65] As is recognized by Dennis C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism and Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-252.

[66] Cotter, *Miracles*, 246; DA II 561; Hull, *Magic*, 116-41; Morton Smith, *Jesus the Magician* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978) 145.

explained in this light, as is his apparent disinclination to ascribe any magical techniques to Jesus. In place of manipulative healings, Jesus heals with a word. The kind of τέχνη, therefore, that Josephus suggests was so characteristic of Solomon, is not at all characteristic of Matthew's Jesus. It raises the question, therefore, why Matthew should choose to emphasize Jesus' association with Solomon, the great exorcist and magician, when he otherwise consistently eliminates any suggestion of magic from his depiction of Jesus. Attractive though the Solomon hypothesis is, it should be rejected.

The optimal solution is to suppose that Matthew has in mind an entirely different conception of the Son of David: the therapeutic aspect of the Son of David probably arises out of Matthew's association of the motif with that of the shepherd. Both the therapeutic and pastoral features lend themselves readily to this interpretation, as can be established from a consideration of David's role as shepherd in the Hebrew Scriptures. There, "shepherding" is often translated as "ruling" or "governing," and kings and shepherds are associated.[67] McHugh has noted, intriguingly, that although the description of a king as shepherd was relatively commonplace in the nations surrounding Israel, it was not usually applied to the kings of Judah and Israel. He observes that apart from "five texts referring to David, no king of Judah or Israel is ever called 'the shepherd of his people.'"[68] David's distinctive calling is particularly emphasized by Psalm 78:70-72: "He chose David his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds; from tending the ewes that had young he brought him to be the shepherd of Jacob his people, of Israel his inheritance. With upright heart he tended them, and guided them with skilful hand."

David's pastoral role, moreover, comes to be increasingly emphasized in the intertestamental period. Several of the extracanonical psalms refer to David as shepherd of his father's flocks,[69] with Psalm 151 making an explicit comparison between the shepherd of a flock and the shepherd of a people. Psalm 151:7(A) has David relate that the Lord "sent and took me from behind the flock,

---

[67] Philo (*Agr*. 41) remarks that "so full of dignity and benefit has the shepherd's task been held to be, that poets are wont to give to kings the title of 'shepherds of peoples' (ποιμενάς λαῶν), a title which the lawgiver bestows on the wise. They are the only real kings, and he shows them to us ruling, as a shepherd does his flock."

[68] John McHugh, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975) 95.

[69] Psalm 151A:1,4 (5ApocSyrPs 4); Psalm 152:3 and implicitly in Psalm 153, where David is delivered from a lion and wolf, and at Sirach 47:3, where he plays with lions and bears.

and he anointed me with holy oil, and he made me leader for his people, and ruler over the sons of his covenant." Pseudo-Philo includes the episode of Samuel's anointing of David, and gives particular prominence to David's humble status. The Lord directs Samuel to "seek out the least shepherd of all and anoint this one."[70]

The identification also figures in the Qumram material; 4Q504 (col. 4) reads: "You have established your covenant with David, making him a princely shepherd over Israel." It is certainly striking that this conception is even evident in the Psalm of Solomon 17.40: "Faithfully and righteously shepherding the Lord's flock, he will not let any of them stumble in their pasture,"[71] even if the Psalm obviously represents a triumphal depiction of the Son of David by referring to him as "mighty in his actions."

Although Matthew may well be cognizant of such traditions, a more probable source for his understanding of the title is Ezekiel.[72] As mentioned above in earlier chapters, a future Davidic shepherd is strongly in evidence at Ezekiel 34. This chapter includes the prediction of a future David in Ezekiel 34:23 (cf. Ezek 37:24), where the Lord states, "I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David (רעה אחד... עגרי רויך), and he shall feed them: he shall feed them and be their shepherd."[73] It is not unlikely, therefore, that this chapter informs Matthew's conception of the therapeutic Son of David.

Nevertheless, two objections spring to mind: first, the passage says nothing about a therapeutic ministry, and, second, it makes no mention of the *son* of David. To the first objection, it can be said that the passage in Ezekiel does indicate that he will "shepherd" them. Precisely what "shepherding" entails is spelt out earlier in the chapter, where God says that he will act as a shepherd. Not only does he promise to feed them (Ezek 34:13, 14), God also goes on to

---

[70] *LAB* 59.3. Note the difference in emphasis from the LXX account: ὁ μικρὸς ἰδοὺ ποιμαίνει ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ (1 βασ 16:11). Here David's slaying of the lions preying upon the flock is paralleled with his coming military triumphs (59.5).

[71] PsSal 17:40 reads: ἰσχυρὸς ἐν ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ κραταιὸς ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ ποιμαίνων τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει ἀσθενῆσαι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ νομῇ αὐτῶν 17.41 ἐν ἰσότητι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἄξει καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτοῖς ὑπερηφανία τοῦ καταδυναστευθῆναι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

[72] Peter M. Head (*Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority* [Cambridge: University Press, 1997] 183) has, independently, emerged with a similar argument. Cf. Hare, *Matthew*, 109.

[73] Matthew may also be alluding to the "David" whom God promises to raise up at Jeremiah 30:8-9 and Hosea 3:4-5.

promise, "I will seek the lost, and I will bring back the strayed, and I will bind up the crippled, and I will strengthen the weak."[74] The chapter's depiction of shepherding is further supplemented by its condemnation of the shepherds of Israel. The Lord reproaches them because "the weak you have not strengthened, the sick you have not healed, the crippled you have not bound up" (Ezek. 34:4).[75] What these passages provide, therefore, is a brief for shepherding that expressly includes healing. David will not only feed his flock he will also heal them.[76] It is true that exorcism is not mentioned here, although it is a feature of Jesus' ministry, but it is evident from the editorial summaries Matthew provides that it would be included as a part of "healing every disease and infirmity" (4:23; 9:35). It is healing and not exorcism that is emphasized by the gospel.

The second objection depends on how literally one understands Son of David. The passage does not mention a Son of David at all, but simply David. Zimmerli has pointed out that such references to a future David are rare in the Hebrew Bible, and are found only twice elsewhere.[77] Is the reference, perhaps, to be regarded as David *redivivus*, whom God will again raise up? While some have thought so,[78] this interpretation has largely been abandoned.[79] Duguid has noted that Ezekiel employs the hifil of קום here, which is characteristic of the promises made to David (2 Sam 7:12,25; 1 Kings 9:5; Jer 33:14; Amos 9:11) to establish his line forever.[80] Yet the reference to David cannot be taken simply as a general allusion to the re-

---

[74] Daniel L. Block ("Bringing Back David: Ezekiel's Messianic Hope" in Sattherthwaite et al., *Lord's Anointed*, 172) aptly describes David as "(under-) shepherd of Yahweh's flock"—David can be presumed to be Yahweh's agent in the healing of the flock.

[75] The rest of Ezekiel 34:4 is also instructive.

[76] Note the connection between healing and shepherding (or leading) in 4Q521 2 (13). Because of its fragmentary character, it is not clear whether it is the Lord or his Messiah who is being described.

[77] Notably at Hos 3:5 and Jer 30:9-10—cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* II (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 219.

[78] Zimmerli (*Ezekiel* II 219) cites F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel erklärt* (Leipzig, 1847) 265.

[79] J. J. M. Roberts ("The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations" in Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, 44), for instance, accounts this suggestion "extremely doubtful." Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, II 219; R. W. Klein, *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1988) 123; Block, "Bringing Back David," 173-4.

[80] Iain Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel* (VTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 47#233. He notes that the same verb is used of the shepherds in Micah 5:4.

establishment of the Davidic dynasty. Block observes that Ezekiel's reference to a singular 'shepherd' and his use of אחד ('one') show that the prophet "envisions a single person, who may perhaps embody the dynasty, but who occupies the throne himself."[81] Hence, the passage is best taken as a promise to "establish" a royal figure like David.[82] The figure mentioned is one of David's descendants, that is, a son of David, and the sentiment expressed is similar to other passages that predict a coming Davidid.[83] It is very likely, then, that Matthew has drawn his therapeutic Son of David from the prophecies about the coming Davidid in Ezekiel. Mark 10:48 may have helped to establish Matthew's focus, but it is Ezekiel that has given Matthew its content and context.[84]

The other feature that makes this proposal attractive is that Ezekiel 34:23 makes reference to "my servant David (עבדי רויך)." David is very frequently described as Yahweh's servant in the Scriptures,[85] and this provides a further link Jesus the Davidid with another of Matthew's important christological strands: Jesus as servant.[86] The identification is most evident in chapter 12 where Matthew has inserted Isaiah 42:1-4 (12:18-21) between two healing accounts (12:9-14 and 12:22-24). The second of these prompts the crowds to ask about the Son of David. Lindars states that "this Davidic title expresses Matthew's own interpretation of Is 42:1-4, which he has just quoted."[87] Matthew's concern to emphasize healing in these *Reflexionszitate* closely aligns Jesus as servant with Jesus as Son

---

[81] Block, "Bringing Back David," 174.

[82] W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 476; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel II*, 219.

[83] G. A. Cooke (*Ezekiel* [ICC Edinburgh:T&T Clark, 1936] 377) cites Rashi as saying "a king from his seed."

[84] This is to imply that Matthew's therapeutic Son of David is his own innovation. It may not be, however. Passages like 4Q521 suggest that healing may have been much more strongly associated with the messiah than our fragmentary record would otherwise indicate.

[85] Block ("David," 175#23) notes that "my servant" is used of David no less than 31 times in the Hebrew Bible.

[86] On the association of messiah with servant, cf. Zech 3:8. The servant in Isaiah 53 is identified with the messiah in the Isaiah Targum (B. Chilton *Isaiah Targum)*. Chilton (*Glory,* 92) believes that this identification is sufficiently early to reflect a primitive messianology "unperturbed by Christian claims." Nevertheless, this connection is doubtful: in spite of his intercessory activity (see Koch, "Messias," 147-48), the picture of the servant in the targum is not at all that of a suffering messiah, but of an exalted servant. See further, Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 119-33.

[87] Lindars, *Apologetic,* 262; cf. Beaton, "Messiah and Justice," 17-20.

of David, and fits admirably with the humility motif described above.[88]

What makes this suggestion particularly attractive is that Ezekiel 34 and 37 have additional messianic associations in their reference to the "prince"(נשׂיא) of the congregation. Ezekiel 34: 23-24 and Ezekiel 37: 24-25 explicitly describe David as "shepherd," "prince" and "servant." In the Qumran literature, for instance, prince was a well-established messianic designation,[89] and it may have held similar connotations for Matthew. In short, Matthew's understanding of Jesus as messiah is drawn from Matthew's reflection on the Scriptures. His depiction is drawn from Ezekiel and establishes Jesus as healer and servant.

E *The Crowds and the Son of David*

It was argued in Chapter Six above that the crowds' use of the title "Son of David" reflects an emerging appreciation of Jesus' identity. Does the rest of the gospel confirm this impression? In particular, what does the crowds' acclamation of Jesus as Son of David in the Triumphal Entry suggest about their understanding? There is no doubt, then, of the messianic connotation of Matthew's title Son of David, but is the crowds' use of the title itself incontrovertibly messianic? The crowds first tentatively describe Jesus as the Son of David at 12:23. In the Triumphal Entry account all tentativeness has disappeared; the μήτι is no longer in force—they now, without question, regard him as the Son of David. As such, then, their acclaim represents a measure of progress. Not only has their attention moved from the deed to the doer, but also the doer himself is now (as never before) acclaimed. The Matthean "Hosanna to the Son of David" is decisive in this respect—Jesus has become the cynosure. Yet, does their acclamation demonstrate that they understand him to be the Messiah?

The answer to this question depends in part on whether the context of the Entry is to be regarded as messianic. Does the cry

---

[88] Barth, (*Tradition*, 128) observes with respect to 12:20a that acts of both healing and preaching are intended. Healing is even more prominent in 8:17, where Matthew has avoided the spiritualizing LXX version of the passage: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται in favour of Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. As Held, *Tradition,* 260, remarks, "There can be no doubt that he speaks of real physical sicknesses."

[89] Abegg ("Messiah at Qumran," 137#38) regards the following instances as messianic: CD 7:20; 1QSb 5:20; 1QM 3:16; 5:1; 4Q161 5-6 3; 4Q266 3 iv 9; 4Q 285 4 2, 6; 5 4; 6 2; 4Q376 1 iii 1, 3; 4Q401 23 1; 4Q432 5 3.

"Hosanna" reflect liturgical usage?[90] This is by no means readily determined. "Hosanna" may reflect liturgical usage, or may at this point have simply become a generalized expression that here, as Goodspeed says, is "no more liturgical than 'God save the King.'"[91] Whatever its precise nuance, however, Fitzmyer has shown that there is no evidence for its association "with a messianic expectation in pre-Christian Judaism."[92]

The reference to ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is a bit more readily established. Some have seen possible messianic allusions here,[93] especially if 11:3 (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) is seen to refer to the Messiah.[94] At 11:3, however, the word is used absolutely—here it is qualified by ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, and therefore cannot be taken as a title.[95] Arens, in his discussion of the phrase, holds that "to come ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is equivalent to [being] 'sent by God,' and implies an 'ambassadorial mission' like that of the prophets, as in 1 Sam. 17,45, wherein David tells Goliath 'I have come against you in the name of the Lord of Hosts.'"[96] Arens goes on to interpret this messianically in light of Zech 9:9,[97] which is to say, he does not regard the utterance as messianic until it is fitted into the larger interpretive framework

---

[90] On Hosanna, Eric Werner's ("Hosanna" in the Gospels," *JBL* 65 (1946) 97-12) proposed solution to the problematic occurrence of the word with the dative is ingenious, but ultimately not convincing. E. Lohse ("ὡσαννά," *TDNT* IX 682-683) suggests that Hosanna had become a stock formula prior to its use in the Christian community (*pace* Strecker, *Weg* 21#3). J. Fitzmyer ("Aramaic Evidence affecting the Interpretation of *Hosanna* in the New Testament" in G. F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 115) makes an effective case for regarding Hosanna "as a cry of greeting or homage." He relates further that "the term undoubtedly represents a cry that Jerusalemites used to greet pilgrims coming to Jerusalem for feasts like that of Tabernacles and perhaps even Passover."

[91] E. J. Goodspeed, *Problems of New Testament Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945) 35.

[92] Fitzmyer, "*Hosanna*," 115. He rightly discounts Werner's argument, and rejects Lohse's evidence as being too late.

[93] Cf. Sand (*Gesetz*, 147) who infers this in light of later Jewish usage: cf. Str-B I 850.

[94] Jacques Dupont ("L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Mt 11, 2-6, Lk 7, 18-23)," *NRTh* 83 (1961) 821) sees 11:3 as referring to "le Juge redoubtable qui condamne les impies," while Eduardo Arens (*The ΗΛΘΟΝ-sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-critical Investigation* [OBO 10; Freiburg: Universität Verlag, 1976] 290) considers it "a circumloquium for 'the Messiah.'" Oscar Cullmann (*The Christology of the New Testament* [2nd ed. London: SCM, 1963] 26; cf. 36) suggests it might refer to the Messiah, or, alternatively, to the "Prophet of the End."

[95] So Arens, *Sayings*, 291.

[96] Arens, *Sayings*, 292-293.

[97] Arens, *Sayings*, 293.

Matthew provides.[98] Thus, the phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is not, of itself, messianic either.

If the above elements need not be regarded as messianic, what about the title Son of David itself? The children's cry at 21:15 received Jesus' approbation and was regarded as "perfect praise." Can the crowds' cry be regarded as less? Several scholars would, in fact, argue that the understanding of the crowds is deficient. Suhl, for instance, attempts to argue that the disciples' failure to join in the crowds' adulation indicates that the crowds' praise is inadequate.[99] The disciples' abstention, however, is better explained by the public character of the title Son of David. Here, more than anywhere else in the gospel, it reflects Jesus' mission to his people (aptly symbolized by the healings in the Temple). Since the disciples are associated with him in that ministry they do not use that title, but κύριος (or Son of God) instead.

Gibbs would also impugn the understanding of the crowds as revealed in the episode of the two blind men, where it could be argued that Matthew has intensified the crowds' lack of perception.[100] In fact, such a case could be made from a detailed consideration of Matthew's changes to Mark's account. Where Mark depicts a large crowd (ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ; 10:46) in which πολλοί rebuke Bartimaeus (Mark 10:48), Matthew has the entire crowd (ὁ δὲ ὄχλος; 20:31) rebuke the blind men. Instead of differentiating among the crowd as he does, for instance, in the Triumphal Entry account,[101] he devolves the entire responsibility onto the crowd as a whole. He has further eliminated the faith motif found in the other member of this doublet (9:29 cf. Mark 10:52), and replaced it with a reference to Jesus' compassion.[102] This is the only time Matthew uses the word with reference to individuals—the other occurrences refer to Jesus' compassion for the

[98] Also significant in this context is Matthew's removal of any explicit reference to king or kingship from the crowd's remarks: cf. Mark 11:10; Luke 19:38 (μαθητῶν); John 12:13.

[99] Suhl, "Davidssohn," 70.

[100] Gibbs, "Purpose," 459; Patte, *Matthew*, 286.

[101] 21:8 ἄλλοι 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες. Cf. Luke's healing account, where it is οἱ προάγοντες (18:39) who rebuke the beggar.

[102] Duling describes the omission of the reference to faith as "strikingly unmatthean" ("Therapeutic," 403). In general, references to Jesus' emotions are downplayed in Matthew (cf. Sanders, *Tendencies*, 186, Loader, "Son of David," 579, though cf. 9:30's difficult ἐνεβριμήθη. Loader ("Son of David," 579#30) translates it as "deeply moved" citing John 11:33, 38. Given the parallel to 20:34, his translation seems likely.

crowds as a whole.[103] The effect of including it here is to produce a marked contrast between the crowd's callousness and Jesus' compassion. Their callousness is unrelieved through the entire account. In Mark, the crowd relents and says to Bartimaeus, "Take heart, rise, he is calling you" (10:49). Matthew excludes the crowd altogether and has Jesus deal with the blind man directly.[104]

Further, Matthew's retention of Mark's twice-iterated "Son of David" (20:30, rebuke 31a, 31b cf. Mark 10:47, 48 rebuke, 48b) heightens the contrast between Jesus and the crowd. So does Jesus' healing of the supplicants' blindness. Gibbs infers that "it would appear that Matthew means to imply that the ὄχλοι, being spiritually blind, still reject the witness of those who can really see that this is *the* Son of David."[105] As a whole, then, the recasting of the pericope presents a more negative portrayal of the crowds than Mark does. This may call their acclaim at 21:9 into question, but it probably does not. Granting that Matthew's version of the narrative is negative, one could readily argue that this pericope represents the crowds finally coming to more of an awareness of who Jesus is, an awareness that effloresces in the Triumphal Entry. Certainly, the children's exact echo of the crowds' adulation a mere six verses later (21:15) must carry more weight. It is perfect praise, and the crowds' utterance is to be regarded as such as well.[106]

In fact, it is fundamental to Matthew's portrayal that Jesus be publicly acclaimed by the crowds. Matthew's Triumphal Entry represents the reaction of Jesus' own subjects. The crowds at this juncture, probably more than at any other place in the gospel, become symbolic of the people of Israel (independent of their leaders).[107] In the above discussion of the "following" motif, it was suggested that Jesus' mere advent was sufficient for the crowds to assemble. Here, in a scene modelled on the acclamation of David by

---

[103] 9:36; 14:14; 15:15. Compare Mark 1:41 (individual); 9:22 (father and son) 6:34; 8:2 (crowds).

[104] This doubtless also reflects Matthew's tendency to abbreviate; cf. Held, *Tradition*, 224-26.

[105] Gibbs, "Purpose," 459; Patte, *Matthew*, 286. Howell (*Matthew's Inclusive Story*, 149) sees it as proleptic for the crowds' rejection of Jesus.

[106] Cf. Moses (*Transfiguration Story*, 198-9), who claims that the children's praise at 21:15 demonstrates the inadequacy of the title Son of David, gives insufficient weight to Jesus' approbation.

[107] Trilling, "Einzug," 303. George M. Soares Prabhu (*The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew* [AnBib 63; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976] 157) observes that "everything that can heighten the impression of the public and popular character of the acclamation is carefully explicated and emphasized."

all of Israel (2 Sam 5:1), Jesus is acclaimed by all of Israel. The crowds are no longer simply the obtuse retinue accompanying Jesus: they, as the people of Israel, acknowledge David's son.[108]

For this reason, analyses that see Matthew's use of the title Son of David as a condemnation of "Israel" are fundamentally mistaken. Loader, for instance, concludes that the title Son of David is used by Matthew to highlight "Israel's unbelief."[109] Kingsbury goes so far as to claim that "Matthew utilizes the title… in order to underline the guilt that devolves upon Israel for not receiving its Messiah."[110] Yet Matthew is surely doing the opposite. Both Kingsbury and Loader mistakenly attempt to group the crowds together with their leaders and contrast them with the faith of the suppliants.

If anything, however, the crowds' use of the title reveals the profound disjunction between the crowds and their leadership (just as it did earlier at 12:22-24). During the public ministry, the crowds' identification of Jesus as the Son of David is, apart from 21:11, the last thing the crowds say (in direct speech) about Jesus. The Pharisees, however, are left speechless after Jesus' question about the Son of David (22:46). The contrast is obvious: the people of Israel perceive what their leaders do not.[111] Jesus accepts the crowds' adulation (as can be inferred from 21:16), just as he reduces the Pharisees to silence.

In fact, the crowds at this point in the gospel are far closer to the suppliants than to their leaders. Despite the disinformation provided by their leadership, the crowds have begun to penetrate the mystery of Jesus' identity. Matthew is showing that the rank and file of Israel did recognize Jesus as messiah. Where Kingsbury and Loader are quite right is in drawing attention to the exceptional understanding and faith of the suppliants.

F *The Son of David and the Lord*

If the crowds display some knowledge of Jesus' identity, the suppliants reveal a profounder understanding. Matthew highlights their insight by having them advert to another christological title—namely κύριος.

---

[108] Davies, *Matthew*, 143.
[109] Loader, "Son of David," 585. See, as well, Carter's (*Matthew*, 194) judgement that the crowds' use of the title betrays "their lack of understanding."
[110] Kingsbury, *Structure*, 103. He claims elsewhere ("Son of David," 601) that, unlike the supplicants the crowds "neither 'see' nor 'confess'" Jesus as the messianic Son of David.
[111] Matera, *Christology*, 40-41.

Each suppliant, when first encountering Jesus, addresses him as Son of David (or Lord, Son of David), entreats him to have mercy, and then moves ultimately to Lord (9:27 [υἱὸς Δαυίδ] 9:28 [κύριε]; 15:22 [κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ] 25, 27 [κύριε], 20:30 [κύριε] υἱὸς Δαυίδ 31 κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ 33 κύριε]).[112] In each of the episodes it is only when Jesus has been addressed exclusively as Lord, that the supplicants are healed.[113] Suhl notes something similar, and points out that only upon the petitioners' second request does Jesus respond with healing.[114] This pattern has been developed by Matthew; the title Son of David does not occur in Mark's account of the Syrophoenician Woman and κύριε appears only once (Mark 7:28 κύριε) versus the four times in Matthew's version (3 times in the vocative 15:22, 25, 27.[115] Nor does κύριε figure in Mark's Bartimaeus narrative, but is prominent in the two narratives Matthew constructs from his *Vorlage*. In Matthew's first version, κύριε occurs once in the first healing of the blind men (9:28) and twice (or three times) in the second healing (20:30 v.l.; 31, 33). Held has remarked on a further difference—in Mark, κύριε is never used in a request.

If, as seems likely, the vocative use of κύριος is more than simply honorific,[116] the suppliants' use of the title indicates a broader

---

[112] There is also textual support for the vocative υἱέ in every instance where the nominative occurs. For an argument defending the primacy of these variants, cf. Kingsbury, "Title," 252#31. To be preferred to Kingsbury's argument is the position of Metzger (*Textual*, 43 citing BDF 147(3)), who recognizes that the more polished style of the vocative suggests that the nominative forms are original.

[113] Carter (*Matthew*, 148#18) attempts to argue that "'Son of David' also means 'Lord,'" but does not consider why it is that the epiclesis invariably moves from Son of David to Lord.

[114] Suhl,"Davidssohn," 73-75.

[115] Just as noteworthy is Matthew's addition of τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν (15:27) to Mark's account.

[116] Bornkamm (*Tradition*, 42) describes it as "the form of address to Jesus as the miracle-working *Saviour*" while Schulz (*Stunde*, 199) states "Der irdische Jesus ist nach Matthäus der göttliche Herr. Der Herr-Anrede gilt deshalb vor allem dem Wundertäter (8,2; 9,28; 15,27; 20, 30; u.ö), aber auch die Anbetung und der aus dem Gottesdienst stammende Ruf "Erbarme dich mein" (9,27; 15,22; u.ö) bzw. "Errette uns" (8,25; 14,20; u.ö) unterstreichen diesen christologischen Sachverhalt. Konsequent scheidet Matthäus deshalb die 'Herr-Anrede der Jünger von derjenigen der Gegner Jesu, die sich mit dem Lehrer-Titel begnügen müssen." Fitzmyer ("κύ ριος" *EDNT* II 329) is more cautious "might", while C. F. D. Moule (*The Origin of Christology* [Cambridge: University Press, 1977] 35) expresses a caveat against understanding the vocative as a christological title. He does allow, citing Matt 7:21, that "the context sometimes enhances the meaning of the vocative" (#48). Might not this allowance be urged in the above instances, not least because of the affinities Schulz has noted between the use of the term by the disciples (8:25; 14:30) and that of the suppliants? Broer ("Christologie," 1269) has noted the association of κύριος

messianic understanding on their part. This view is also supported by the fact that two of the three supplicants are explicitly commended for their faith (9:29 [cf. Mark 10:52]; 15:28 [no //])[117]—no insignificant detail in a gospel where Jesus' own disciples are criticized for their "little faith." It is, moreover, a feature that ties in with their repeated requests and their final appeal to Jesus as Lord. For these reasons, it is best to conclude that the supplicants have a broader messianic understanding. Not only have they recognized Jesus *qua* therapeutic healer of Israel, but they also have recognized the authority that underlies his healings. They discover in Jesus the authoritative Lord. It is their recognition of and appeal to this authority that results in their healing.

Ironically, it is this very insight into Jesus' nature that distinguishes them as 'outsiders.' Contrary, to Gerhardsson's view, however, the suppliants are not "ignorant" outsiders.[118] Their insight surpasses that of the crowds and comes close to that of the disciples. They are outsiders because their understanding and faith surpasses that of the crowds; they are distinct, therefore from the people of Israel as a whole. At the same time, they have not been summoned by Jesus to a life of discipleship, so they do not belong to the ranks of disciples either. In fact, they give expression to what happens to those who take up Jesus' invitation to come him (cf. 11:28). Because their use of κύριος approximates that of the disciples (and not least because one is a Gentile), these healings may also be proleptic for the later situation of the church. The suppliants' use of the historicizing Son of David here situates them within Jesus' historical ministry to Israel, but the use of κύριος points to a time beyond this and to a situation and milieu where Jesus' authority is implicitly recognized. As A. J. Hultgren has argued, there is probably a liturgical sense underlying the title, especially in the collocation κύριε ἐλέησον.[119] Matthew's framing of the discussion, therefore, might, in part, be said to

---

with proskunesis. Further, if κύριος were merely honorific, its use alone after Son of David would represent a denouement. Yet the context in the stories suggests an intensificiation. Kingsbury ("Title," 253) has missed the force of this. He (albeit tentatively) suggests that "*kyrie*" is meant to refer beyond itself to Son of David as the primary title." Yet if this were so, one would expect Son of David in the ultimate position—instead, the intensification is expressly associated with κύριος.

[117] At 20:30, the motif is replaced by a reference to Jesus' compassion.

[118] Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 88.

[119] A. J. Hultgren, "Liturgy and Literature: The Liturgical Factor in Matthew's Literary and Communicative Art" in T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm (eds.), *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995) 664-66.

advocate and reflect the use of κύριος—particularly in epiclesis—within his community.

Two consequences follow from the observations above. The first is that the Son of David is the christological title that discloses Jesus' precise relation to the people of Israel. Matthew recognizes Son of David as a legitimate title, but one with distinct parameters. It is more particularly fitted to Israel as a whole than to the "nations" or to his community. Jesus does not use it, because it is not determinative of his self-understanding. The disciples do not use it of Jesus because they are involved in the same ministry as Jesus. Matthew does use it because he is very much occupied with delineating that ministry. Suppliants use it because they recognize Jesus' therapeutic ministry to Israel. They move to the title "Lord" because their faith brings them to recognize a fact that the Pharisees cannot even conceive of—namely, the divine and authoritative stature of Christ as Lord. In sum, therefore, the title Son of David is one that is very much informed by *Heilsgeschichte*. If Raymond Brown deems Son of David a "correct but inadequate title of the Jesus of the Matthean ministry," he is mistaken, at least so far as the ministry to Israel is concerned.[120] For Matthew, Son of David *is* the characteristic title of Jesus' exclusive ministry.

The second consequence concerns the crowds' understanding of Jesus as Son of David. As they do not describe Jesus as "Lord" and are not commended for their faith, it is likely that they do not have a full appreciation of Jesus' identity. They recognize him as the Son of David and acclaim as the messianic heritor of the promises to David. Their conception of Jesus as Messiah is of a divinely anointed human figure, who will lead them, heal them, and care for them. While the crowds come to an understanding of Jesus as Son of David, they do not go beyond this insight to recognize Jesus as David's Lord. In short, their understanding, as compared with that of the suppliants is accurate but limited.

G *Conclusion*

The above discussion prompts two sets of conclusions—the first concerning the Son of David, the second concerning the crowd's reaction to him. In the first gospel, Son of David is an adequate christological title, and Matthew demonstrates how Jesus is both the

[120] Brown, *Birth*, 134.

heir to it and the culmination of it. Because of this heritage (and its juxtaposition with Son of Abraham 1:1) the title is a public one and characterizes Jesus in his ministry to Israel. Matthew's depiction of the Son of David reveals not a triumphant ruler, but a servant and healer *par excellence*.

The crowds' reaction to Son of David can best be described as a continuation of their response to his miracles and healings discussed in Chapter Six. It represents a clear development or progression on their part, in that their interest has begun to centre on Jesus. The tentative identification at 12:23 of Jesus with the Son of David becomes a messianic confession in the Triumphal Entry.

An element of this recognition is clearly christological. Their use of the title not only draws attention to Jesus but also, along with the suppliants' use of it, gives content to Matthew's conception of the Son of David. Being Israelites, they are the people he has come to serve, and, being sick and in need, the people he has come to heal. The crowds' cry at 21:9 is particularly instrumental in drawing attention to the primacy of healing in Matthew's messianic portrayal. The suppliants' insight into Jesus' divine nature is even more profound. Their use of the title κύριος reveals that they not only recognize Jesus in his role as messiah to Israel, but also as the authoritative Lord.

PART III

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this section was to examine the "favourable" characterization of the crowds in the gospel. As was mentioned in Chapter One, this portrayal includes most of the crowds' words and actions during Jesus' public ministry. Accordingly, the section began with an assessment of Jesus' ministry to the crowds to see how Jesus' own actions were represented in the gospel. The role of the crowds is partly modelled on the picture inherited from Mark's gospel. They are the receptive masses who respond to Jesus' ministry. They react to his teaching, his healings, and they follow him about. In Matthew, however, there is a distinctive globalizing of these features. The crowds react at key intervals, such as the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, the close of the Messiah of Deeds sequence, and at the Triumphal Entry.

The Role of the Crowds: Their Situation The above chapters indicate that the crowds are to be situated in their approach to Jesus midway between the disciples and their leaders. On the one hand, the crowds are to be distinguished from the disciples. The crowds respond with amazement and wonder at Jesus' thaumaturgy, while the disciples are usually portrayed as being unmoved, simply because they understand. When the disciples do react, they worship Jesus. The crowds do not worship Jesus, but they praise God because of him, and evince an increasing penetration of Jesus' identity, even if it stops well short of the understanding displayed by the disciples.

As "lost sheep," the crowds are the object of Jesus' and the disciples' ministry. The disciples are specifically enlisted to aid Jesus in the feedings of the crowds; they figure as Jesus' coworkers precisely because he has commanded them to renounce themselves and follow him as disciples. Here the disciples perform the will of the Father. This cannot be said of the crowds' following, as it is not initiated by Jesus. They follow Jesus as needy subjects, who look to Jesus and his disciples to requite their needs. The situations of the disciples and crowds are, therefore, categorically different.

Yet, the crowds are also categorically different from their leaders. Where the crowds demonstrate an instinctive openness to Jesus' words and deeds, the reactions of the Pharisees and other leaders is entirely negative. Throughout Jesus' public ministry, the leaders of

their people do their utmost to subvert Jesus' influence, and to prevent the crowds from gaining an accurate perception of Jesus' identity. As characteristic examples of "bad shepherds," they show no concern for the needs of the people of Israel, but merely for their own influence.

The crowds, therefore, as was suggested in an earlier chapter, do in fact occupy a position midway between that of the disciples and their leaders. That this is not a static position is also an important consideration for the evangelist: the crowds are, in despite of their leaders, instinctively gravitating toward a position of increased understanding.

The Role of the Crowds: Their Favourable Portrayal Two features contribute to a positive portrayal of the crowds. The first is their instinctive appreciation of Jesus. That they appear to be gaining inklings of Jesus' identity means that they are characterized in a positive light. Their openness to Jesus cannot but contrast favourably with the wilful blindness of their leaders. The second feature is their absolute helplessness. Their want of good leadership, their need of healing, of feeding, of direction—all these traits place the crowds in a sympathetic light. Jesus' compassion for the crowds awakens the reader's compassion.

The Function of the Crowds: Christology Matthew clearly uses Jesus' involvement with the crowds to develop his Christology, and his Christology to develop his representation of the crowds. As was demonstrated in Section One, the crowds are Israelites without a leader. As leaderless sheep, they instinctively search out their shepherd, and begin consciously to appreciate him for what and who he is. Their dawning recognition, in turn, informs the reader. Through his use of the crowds, therefore, Matthew is able to reveal Jesus as the Davidid whom God would raise up. Their gathering together from all Israel has a significant correspondence with the behaviour of Israel at the inception of David's rule and signals the appearance of the Son of David.

As the Scriptures suggest, shepherding is a feature of the Davidic rule. The same holds true for Jesus' role as servant. In Matthew, shepherd, servant, and Son of David complement each other and disclose a figure who is the virtual antithesis of the warlike, conquering Messiah. Matthew uses the crowds to limn the features of this figure. Obviously, the suppliants also contribute to this portrayal, but the crowds give official expression to it. In the Triumphal Entry, the crowds, as representatives of Israel, formally announce to Jerusalem

(and to their leaders) the advent of the Son of David. Thus, the behaviour of the crowds, in their instinctive recognition of Jesus as Son of David serves to confirm what Matthew has already made explicit at 1:1 and in the genealogy: Jesus is indeed the long-expected and awaited Son of David. The function of the crowds, as the people of Israel, is to ratify this identification.

The Function of the Crowds: Heilsgeschichte The above summations have just dealt with Matthew's portrayal of the crowds and of Jesus. Yet the real import of this section has been to show the two of them together: rex et grex, the visitation of God among his people. Matthew's portrayals of Jesus and the crowds are, quite literally, made for each other—a match made in heaven. That is to say, Matthew's characterizations of Jesus and the crowds have been developed with each other in mind. The crowds need healing, and Jesus is the divine healer, they want leadership, and Jesus is the very royal Davidid whom they require. Jesus, the Son of David, is specifically sent to minister to his people, the children of Israel.

Matthew, in other words, is giving content to Jesus' (and the disciples') exclusive ministry to Israel. It is very unlike the generalized ministry of the gospel of Mark, where all alike are the recipients of Jesus' largesse. Here, Matthew is deliberately sketching out the parameters of a "customized" ministry to Israel. Jesus, the Son of David, has come specifically for them, and his ministry corresponds to their needs. This ministry is calculated, therefore, to give content to Jesus' particularist ministry to Israel mentioned at 10:6 and 15:24. Matthew's appeals to the fulfilment of prophecy help to establish the matrix of Jesus' activity. The result evokes a messianic idyll when the people are joined with their godsent leader. King and flock are united at last.

The Function of the Crowds: Apologetic The favourable role of the crowd also has a manifest apologetic function. For one thing, it makes it incontrovertible that the Davidic messiah came deliberately to minister to his people and was both recognized and acclaimed by them. For another, it reveals the perfidy of the crowds' leadership, and shows them to be entirely deserving of the rubric "evil shepherds."

This page intentionally left blank

PART IV

DEATH AND THE PROPHET

Just as the mandate of the previous section was to examine the "favourable" role of the crowds, this section's objective will be to consider their "unfavourable" role. Naturally, this examination will include the crowds' involvement in the Passion of Jesus, but it will also include some less obviously negative features, such as their identification of Jesus as a prophet. It will also discuss Jesus' interaction with the crowds in the Parable discourse of Matthew 13. The rationale for dealing with both subjects here, and not in the previous section will be made evident in the chapters themselves.

The purpose of this particular segment is to determine whether Matthew is simply reliant upon tradition for his negative representation of the crowds, or whether he himself is responsible. If Matthew is responsible, it will attempt to determine why he has portrayed the crowds in such a light. The first chapter (Chapter 9) will address the crowds' acclamation of Jesus as prophet, and will be followed by an examination of the crowds' role in the Passion (Chapter 10). The final chapter of this section will consider the place of the crowds in the Parable discourse (Chapter 11).

As in the previous section, it will sometimes be necessary to sketch out other questions—such as Matthew's understanding of parables—in order to determine their pertinence to the portrayal of the crowds.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER NINE

A *Prophet*

The intention of this chapter is to assess the crowds' identification of Jesus as a prophet at 21:11. As mentioned in the last section, the crowd's response to the people of Jerusalem that "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας 21:11) occurs immediately after Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Given the prominence accorded to the question and to the crowds' answer, it is obviously of considerable significance for assessing the reaction of the crowds. The following discussion, therefore, will first consider the provenance of the passage and the place of the eschatological prophet in Matthew. It will then proceed to examine 21:11, and conclude with an examination of the implications of the verse for an understanding of the crowds.

The first question to consider is whether the crowds' response at 21:11 should be construed as an integral part of the Triumphal Entry scene. While it is generally regarded as such, Van Tilborg and Walker have argued that the crowds in the unit at 21:10-11 ought to be distinguished from the crowds in 21:9. Both scholars maintain that the former group's insight into Jesus' nature is considerably more profound, and, therefore, must represent the perspective of a different crowd.[1] Their surmise is doubtful, however, when the form of the passage is taken into account. The genitive absolute εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (21:10) correlates Jesus' entrance with the stirring up of the city and indicates that Jesus' entry is still in view at 21:10. For that matter, the narrative does not even allow for a second group. If the "entire city" is asking who Jesus was, where would this second set of crowds have come from, and, more to the point, how would they know Jesus' identity? Instead, the ongoing reference to the crowds,[2] as well as the recurring use of direct discourse with its express focus on Jesus indicate that the episode is an integral element of Matthew's version of the Triumphal Entry, and that there is only one group of crowds.

---

[1] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 145; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 63.

[2] 21:8 ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες 21:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι. Contrast these with Mark 11:8 (πολλοί) and Mark 11:9 (οἱ προάγοντες).

Both verses (21:10-11) are also best regarded as a Matthean composition.[3] Meyer has sought to argue on the basis of a difference in style and tenor that Matthew is reliant on tradition here, but neither the style nor the tenor of the passage support his claims.[4] Quite apart from the overwhelming Matthean vocabulary[5] and the typical use of the genitive absolute, the reminiscences of Matthew 2:1-3 are also thoroughly Matthean.[6] Prabhu concurs with this judgement, except that he detects a "traditional datum" in the word προφήτης itself because, as he claims, "προφήτης is not a Matthean title for Jesus."[7] Prabhu, however, overlooks the frequency with which the word προφήτης and its cognates are found in the gospel.[8] More significantly, he also overlooks the frequency with which the word prophet is associated with the crowds in material that Matthew has reduplicated (14:5; 21:26; 21:46).[9] Since 21:46, a Matthean construct, indicates that the crowds regarded Jesus as a prophet, it seems safe to suppose that "prophet" is a Matthean title for Jesus, at least so far as the crowds are concerned. In light of the above features, therefore, the Matthean character of the passage becomes evident.

B *The Eschatological Prophet*

If Matthew composed the account, what did he mean by it? Is Matthew simply having the crowds say, "This is the prophet from

---

[3] DA III 126-7.

[4] Rudolf Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelisten* [Leipzig:1940] 137#71: "Unterschied in Stil und Tenor." See also Rudolf Meyer, "ὄχλος" 587#27 and Burger, *Davidssohn*, 85. Van Tilborg (*Leaders*, 145) is uncertain whether the passage is Matthean.

[5] Gundry (*Matthew*, 411) rightly regards ἐσείσθη, πᾶσα, πόλις and λέγουσα in 21:10 and οὗτος ἐστιν, crowds, prophets, Jesus' name, and Nazareth and Galilee in 21:11 as part of Matthew's special vocabulary. Prabhu (*Formula*, 152) and Schnider (*Prophet*, 102-4) both consider 21:11 a redactional composition.

[6] Prabhu, *Formula*, 152.

[7] Prabhu, *Formula*, 152. In contrast, Künzel (*Gemeindeverständnis*, 63#47) speaks of "die redaktionelle Kennzeichnung Jesu als 'Prophet' in 21,11,46."

[8] Gundry (*Matthew*, 647) lists the occurrences of προφήτης in the Synoptic Gospels as: (37 6 29), while for the προφη lexical form it is: (45 9 32).

[9] J. C. Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, 169 italics his) categorizes this as one of the repeated formulae, "which are used once by a Synoptist in common with one or both of the others, and are *also* used by that Synoptist independently in other parts of his narrative." Matthew apparently derives the formula from Mark 11:32.

Nazareth, of whom you have already heard,"[10] or are they proclaiming that Jesus is something more than an ordinary prophet, that he is "the prophet"—the predicted eschatological "prophet like Moses"? The difference is no inconsiderable one, for if it could be shown that the crowds understand Jesus as the "eschatological prophet," one would need to impute to them considerably more insight and understanding than if they simply regarded Jesus as "a prophet." What follows, therefore, is a brief examination of the place of the "eschatological prophet" in Matthew.

The first issue to resolve, then, is precisely what the "prophet like Moses" signifies. The conception has its origin in Deuteronomy 18, where Moses addresses Israel, and predicts: "The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet" (Deut 18:15). Moses goes on to relate the words of the Lord himself shortly afterward: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command" (Deut 18:18).

Naturally, these passages in Deuteronomy gave rise to a plethora of questions: do the passages refer to one figure, or to many? Is there an eschatological stamp to these verses? Will the prophet be like Moses, or will Moses himself return? Speculation about these questions in the Second Temple period produced an abundance of complex, amorphous and occasionally contradictory interpretations, some of which naturally overlapped with equally diverse and contradictory messianic expectations.[11]

Given the complexity of the questions, it is not unexpected that modern attempts at untangling them have not always proved to be entirely successful. Methodological considerations occasionally

---

[10] It is generally acknowledged that the historical Jesus displayed certain "prophetic" characteristics. See the now classic exposition by C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet" in G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann (eds.), *Mysterium Christi* (London: Longman, Green and Co., 1930) 53-66, as well as E. Earle Ellis, "Prophecy in the New Testament Church and Today" in J. Panagopoulos (ed.), *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today* (NovTSup 45; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 47.

[11] Paul Volz's (*Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* [Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1934] 201) remarks about the *Mannigfaltigkeit* of messianic expectation in the Second Temple period are still very apt: "das fromme Judentum im Zeitalter Jesu Christi nicht eine einheitliche, sondern eine mannigfaltige 'Messiashoffnung' hatte, und es lässt sich vermuten, dass sich die verschiedenen eschatologischen Heilsgestalten auf verschiedene Kreise im Volk verteilt haben. Die verschiedenen Gruppen in Zeitalter Jesu werden sich ihren besonderen 'Messias,' Erlöser, Heilbringer erdacht und ihn in sehr verschiedener Gestalt erwartet haben."

obtrude,[12] and in some instances, the questions that are asked about the prophet have already determined what the answer will be.[13] Recently, Allison has attempted to examine afresh the role of Moses and the prophet like Moses in Matthew. He begins by isolating a number of relatively discrete—if inevitably overlapping—interpretations:

1. Deuteronomy is referring to a number of prophets like Moses
2. A series of prophet-kings over Israel
3. An eschatological individual figure (in addition to the Davidic Messiah or the priestly Messiah)
4. The Messiah[14]

Allison considers each of these alternatives, and identifies the last of these interpretations as the view of Matthew: "Matthew and Mark plainly identify… Jesus with the prophet like Moses."[15] While this viewpoint is certainly possible, it has to be queried whether Matthew does "plainly" identify Jesus with the prophet like Moses.[16] Allison appears to assume that the mere presence of Mosaic typology in Matthew is sufficient to establish a connection between Jesus and the prophet like Moses.[17] Do examples of Mosaic typology

---

[12] See Richard A. Horsley ("Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins," *JSNT* 26 (1986) 20) for a criticism of the "highly synthetic" treatments of the eschatological prophet by Oscar Cullmann (*The Christology of the New Testament* [2nd Ed.; London: SCM, 1963]) and Ferdinand Hahn (*Christologische Hoheitstitel: ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964]). On the other hand, Horsley's own treatment of the eschatological prophet ("Like One of the Prophets of Old: Two types of Popular Prophets at the time of Jesus," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 437-443) is itself too summary and precipitate.

[13] Charles Perrot ("Un prophète comme l'un des prophètes (Mc 6:15)" in J. Doné, P. Grelot (eds.), *De la Torah au Messie. Etudes d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (Paris: Desclées, 1981) 417-423), for instance, imports the "Mosaic eschatological prophet" into a discussion of Mark 8:28, and, not surprisingly, emerges with it in his conclusions.

[14] See Allison, *The New Moses*, 73-5 for a list and assessment of the sources he draws upon. David E. Aune (*Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 124-28) also provides a balanced discussion of the issues.

[15] Allison, *The New Moses*, 77.

[16] It is revealing that Allison finds the clearest association of the Messiah with the eschatological prophet not in Matthew but in Acts 3:17-26 (*The New Moses*, 75, 88).

[17] Commentators are divided concerning the extent of references and allusions to Moses in Matthew. Explicit references to Moses in Matthew are less numerous than in the other two Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 7, Mark 8, Luke 10). Many scholars would find at least some in the Infancy Narratives and the Sermon on the Mount. Cf., among others: Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 400-402; Kingsbury, *Structure*, 88-92; and Prabhu, *Formula*, 7-8. On the Mosaic typology in the Infancy narrative in particular see

necessarily make the identification explicit?[18]

H. M. Teeple would suggest that it does. He maintains that the Mosaic allusions are themselves sufficiently pronounced to identify Jesus as the Mosaic eschatological prophet.[19] Nevertheless, Teeple's discussion is not without problems. The first is one to which he himself draws attention, namely that "the prophecy from Deuteronomy… is not mentioned in this Gospel."[20] Instead, Teeple attempts to isolate other instances where Matthew has emphasized Jesus' status as a prophet. Teeple relates that "the author of Matthew regarded Jesus as like Moses but did he believe that, like Moses, Jesus was a prophet? The answer is definitely "Yes," for not only does Matthew copy Mark's traditions in which Jesus is a prophet (Jesus is not called a "prophet" in the Q source), but he adds two others" [sc. 21:11, 10:41].[21] Teeple's argument here is problematic. Do references to Jesus as *a* prophet necessarily connote the Mosaic eschatological prophet?[22] Teeple's supposition might carry a modicum of conviction if he could relate any one of his "prophet" *Stellen* in Matthew to a Mosaic motif.[23] He is unable to do so, however.

Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς" 870-871. On the typology associated with the Sermon on the Mount, see Davies, *Setting*, 25-108 and the list in Donaldson, *Mountain*, 253#27. Allison (*The New Moses*, 140-270) does not stop at these two passages, but, in a richly modulated discussion, detects Mosaic allusions and echoes in the entire fabric of the gospel. Even if his treatments of individual passages are not always convincing, he does build a cumulative case. In addition to Allison, see the works by P. Josef M. Kastner (*Moses im Neuen Testament* [Inaugural-Dissertation; Munich: Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, 1967]) and Tadashi Saito (*Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament* [Bern: Peter Lang, 1977]), who both examine Mosaic typology in Matthew. Of the two, Kastner's is the more nuanced. Saito tends consistently to underestimate the force of the Moses motif in Matthew.

[18] See e.g., Allison, *The New Moses*, 249. Allison himself (p. 92) rightly recognizes that Matthew's reasons for associating Jesus with Moses were probably "multiple."

[19] Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 10; Philadelphia: SBL, 1957).

[20] Teeple, *Prophet*, 88. It is noteworthy that Teeple does not take 17:5 into account. As will be shown shortly, some scholars do detect a reference to Deut 18 in the transfiguaration narrative.

[21] Teeple, *Prophet*, 83.

[22] In Matthew, only 21:11 is definite; the τῶν προφητῶν of 16:14 refers to a distinct group.

[23] Teeple's attempt to identify the eschatological prophet at 10:41 is questionable. The verse's context in the Mission discourse suggests that it is better understood as positing a correlation between Jesus and Matthew's community. See, in particular, S. Brown, "Mission to Israel," 77. Whether the eschatological prophet is in view at 21:11 will be considered below.

In fact, leaving 21:11 to one side, there appears to be only one place in the gospel where one might actually find an express correlation—17:5.[24] W. D. Davies adjudges that, it is "possible, even probable, that we should understand the phrase in the light of Deut XVIII 15."[25] Allison is more confident yet; he contends that "Matthew rescripted Mark in order to push thoughts toward Moses."[26] Allison offers further details to buttress this contention, but taken cumulatively they are still less than decisive.[27] The most significant feature he adduces is a textual variant where the order of αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε has been inverted to reflect Deuteronomy 18:15. It is true, as he notes, that the manuscripts "are divided," but the earlier manuscript traditions tend to favour the non-inverted reading, and the later traditions the inverted reading.[28] In sum, if Matthew is referring to the prophet like Moses here, it is a surprisingly muted reference. Yet, this likely remains the only probable allusion to the "prophet like Moses" in the entire gospel. Matthew has not introduced the reference elsewhere.[29]

Even if one were to suppose that there is a reference to the Mosaic prophet here, it would still be far from evident that Matthew means to identify Jesus with him. As John Riches convincingly argues, in Matthew's account the figure of Moses is superseded.[30] Matthew

---

[24] Teeple does not consider this passage. One could, in addition, conceivably adduce 16:14 (᾿Ιερεμίαν ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφητῶν), though it seems unlikely in the extreme that Matthew would explicitly mention Jeremiah and confine Moses to the ranks of "one of the prophets."

[25] Davies, *Setting*, 53; cf. 50-56; DA II 702; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 494; H. Riesenfeld, (*Jésus Transfiguré: L'Arrière-Plan du Récit Evangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur* (ASNU; København: Einar Monksgard, 1947) 270.

[26] Allison, *The New Moses*, 244. So, too, Kastner (*Moses*, 129) who remarks that 17:5 is "ohne Zweifel Dt 18, 15-18 entnommen."

[27] Allison, *The New Moses*, 244; cf. DA II 686 and Moses, *Transfiguration Story*, 145-46. Allison notes that Moses is now mentioned first, that Jesus is possessed of a luminous face; and that the cloud of the transfiguration is now "bright," recalling the Shekinah. He further claims that the "Son in whom I am well pleased" recalls Is 42:1, which has Mosaic associations. None of these points, however, is very substantial: compare Luz's (*Matthäus 8-17*, 507) very different assessment of some of these same features, which concludes that: "Unsere Geschichte enthält zweifellos Erinnerungen an die Sinaitradition, aber sie lässt sich nicht ausschliesslich von hier aus verstehen."

[28] Allison, *The New Moses*, 244#262; C L W Θ f^{13} and the Majority text favour his reading, while B D f^{1} and 33 favour ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

[29] On the other hand, it must be noted that Luke has not done so either, though he does refer to the passage twice in Acts (Acts 3:22; 7:37), and has, moreover, inverted Mark's αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. Lindars (*Apologetic*, 204) plausibly suggests that Luke's αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (Luke 9:35) has been inverted so as to bring it into harmony with Deut 18:15. It is likely that Luke's inversion led later copyists to do the same in Matthew, precisely to bring it in line with Deut 18:15.

[30] Riches, *Matthew*, 93-8.

emphasizes that Jesus is left alone (αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον 17:8) after Moses and Elijah leave. Further, Matthew draws attention to Jesus' capacity to command by placing the disciples' epiphany after the *bath qôl* and not before it (17:6).[31] Most decisive, though, is the *bath qôl*'s identification of Jesus as "my beloved son." Jesus eclipses Moses—he is ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (17:5; cf. 3:17). So even if there is some identification with the teaching role of the prophet intended here, it is an identification that is ultimately superseded. Matthew indicates that Jesus is far more than the prophet, just as, in the antitheses, Jesus' teaching transcends that of Moses. For this reason, it is better simply to concur with David Aune's assertion that Matthew "never attempts to identify Jesus with the eschatological prophet."[32]

In conclusion, Matthew does not demonstrate much appreciable interest in the Mosaic eschatological prophet. In the one place where there may be a reference to the eschatological prophet as such, Matthew focusses attention on Jesus' divine sonship. Jesus is not the "prophet like Moses," he is something quite different.

C *The Eschatological Prophet at 21:11?*

If there is little evidence for the eschatological prophet elsewhere in the gospel, what about at Matthew 21:11—οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας? The question is a contentious one, and scholars remain considerably divided on the issue.[33] Of those who do discern the eschatological prophet at 21:11,

---

[31] Davies, *Setting*, 54.

[32] Aune, *Prophecy*, 155. Lindars (*Apologetic*, 205) is of the opinion that "There are indications of a Moses typology in both Matthew and Luke . . . But this parallel is not equivalent to a Messianism of Deut. 18." Consult, as well, Saito (*Mosevorstellungen*, 71), who relates that "Es gibt aber kein Anzeichen dafür, dass unsere Geschichte durch den Gedanken des eschatologischen Propheten wie Mose beeinflusst wird." Kastner (*Moses*, 171) holds that, "Wie für den synoptischen Stoff gilt auch hier [i.e., for the Matthean *Sondergut*], dass man die Mosestypologie nicht auf die Vorstellung vom eschatologischen Prophet wie Moses reduziert."

[33] How controverted the question is can be seen from a sampling of some of the specialized studies devoted to Christology or prophecy. The following scholars do consider 21:11 to be a reference to the eschatological prophet: Cullmann, *Christology*, 34 though he acknowledges the fact "that he is only *a* prophet, cannot be excluded;" J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980) 137-139; G. Friedrich, "προφήτης κτλ" *TDNT* VI 846; Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 356-8; Meyer, *Prophet*, 18-19; Schnider, *Prophet*, 54, 236-237. David Hill (*New Testament Prophecy* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1979] 51) acknowledges the possibility. Those who do not discern the eschatological prophet at 21:11 include: Félix Gils, *Jésus Prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques* (Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1975) 25, 43#1; R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten," *SE* I=TU 73 (1963) 624.

A. Sand has advanced the most sustained argument.[34] He maintains that the presence of the definite article ὁ with προφήτης is a reference to the endtime prophet,[35] while ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ ought to be taken as an allusion to the fulfilment citation at 2:23. According to Sand, 2:23 is itself to be understood as an allusion to Scriptural passages that are, in turn, "references to the endtime prophet."[36]

Sand's argument is problematic. In the first place, the very formulation of the crowds' appellation suggests that they are referring to "Jesus, the prophet, the one from Galilee," and not "*the* prophet Jesus who is from Nazareth of Galilee."[37] As Schnackenburg argues, in Matthew 21:11 the article is to be explained through its connection with Jesus' name: the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee.[38] If Jesus were indeed "the prophet," his Nazarean provenance would be of little relevance. Matthew, therefore, has the crowds identify Jesus as the Galilean prophet, and not as the eschatological prophet.

That this sort of geographical designation for Jesus is characteristic of Matthean usage can be established from the inclusion of both Nazareth and Galilee in Matthew's version of Peter's denial (26:69-75). Here Matthew has altered Mark's account in several suggestive ways. In 26:69 it is Jesus and not Peter (as in Mark 14:70) who is identified as a Galilean—καὶ σὺ ἦσθα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου. Here Γαλιλαίου is a *hapax* in the NT. There is a further change at 26:71, where Matthew refashions Mark's μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ (Mark 14:67) into οὗτος ἦν μετὰ *Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου*. Once more, the names Jesus and Nazareth are explicitly connected. These passages have obvious affinities with 21:11 and indicate that the passage is designed to identify Jesus by his place of origin. Peter's accusers know who Jesus is because the crowds had told them as Jesus entered the city.

These geographical referents also contribute to the humility motif already established in the Triumphal Entry. Stanton observes that early Christian communities would not have regarded Nazareth or Galilee as messianic locales. The early church made this scandal part of its message.[39] If so, this feature has likely been included to

---

[34] Sand, *Gesetz*, 140-142.
[35] Sand, *Gesetz*, 140. See also, Allison, *The New Moses*, 249, though Allison qualifies his judgement; he relates that the definite article at 21:11 "could well" refer to the prophet like Moses.
[36] Sand, *Gesetz*, 141.
[37] Sand (*Gesetz*, 140) does recognize that the article also serves as a "Näherbestimmung," but it should be regarded entirely as such.
[38] Schnackenburg, "Erwartung," 627.
[39] G. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 27; Cambridge: University Press, 1974) 154-6.

emphasize the paradox of the Triumphal Entry—the humble Messiah comes from an insignificant city,[40] in an (arguably) despised district,[41] even if, unbeknownst to the crowds, he was actually born in the city of David (2:1).

Sand further claims that 21:11 alludes to the fulfilment citation at 2:23 (πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται). Nazareth certainly occurs at 2:23, but it is questionable whether Matthew is alluding to the fulfilment citation. If he were intent on drawing a connection with "what was spoken by the prophets," would he not have been more likely to use the *Stichwort* Ναζωραῖος at 21:11? The word means ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ,[42] and is one that Matthew uses again at 26:71. Its absence at 21:11 may suggest that no connection is to be made.

One must also question Sand's assumption that the Old Testament נזר *Stellen* behind 2:23 do refer to the eschatological prophet. There are several serious problems with his supposition. The first is that, in Prabhu's words, "the identification of the biblical allusion in the cryptic . . . Mt 2:23 is surely one of the best known *cruces* of Synoptic exegesis."[43] Sand decides in favour of Isaiah 11:1,[44] and reserves judgement on the Nazirite material in the Samson tradition (Judg 13:4-7; 16:17).[45] Yet these represent just two of a number of possible texts,[46] and it may even be, as Strecker argues, that Matthew has no specific passage from the Hebrew Scriptures in mind at 2:23.[47] Even if one were to grant Sand's assumption that Isaiah 11:1 does underlie Matthew 2:23, where does one find the

---

[40] On Nazareth, cf. John 1:46 and Clemens Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten der Evangelien* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1959) 89; cf. W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land*, 239.

[41] Cf. John 7:52; mNed. 2:4; bErub. 53b; G. Stemburger, "Galilee," 409-438 and G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM, 1983) 42-57. Freyne (*Galilee*, 259-343) argues, with some justice, for a more favourable assessment of Galilee.

[42] Prabhu (*Formula*, 201) notes that Matthew "always understands Ναζωραῖος, as ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ."

[43] Prabhu, *Formula*, 193.

[44] Following R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 97-104.

[45] E. Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen" in E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963) 53-55.

[46] E.g., Zech 3:8; Jer 31:6-7. For a good survey of these possibilities, including alternatives Sand does not discuss, cf. Prabhu, *Formula*, 192-216; G. F. Moore, "Nazarene and Nazareth," Appendix B in ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, vol. I, Prolegomena I (London: Macmillan, 1920) 426-432; Stendahl, *School*, 103-104, 198-199.

[47] Strecker, *Weg*, 61 contends that "hier eine bestimmte Schriftstelle nicht angezogen zu sein scheint." See, in addition, Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 66-67.

eschatological prophet like Moses? Isaiah 11:1 is far more likely to refer to a Davidic figure. As David was also popularly regarded as a prophet, why should not the reference be to a prophetic Son of David?[48]

An additional difficulty with Sand's supposition is that it is the crowds who make this assessment of Jesus. It may be that Matthew intends for his readers, on the basis of 2:23, to recognize its application to Jesus; it is an attractive supposition and the "shoot from the stump of Jesse" has obvious associations with the Son of David. Further, as Allison has suggested, the equation of the two neatly unites the prophetic and kingly offices of Jesus.[49] Are readers meant to suppose, however, that the *crowds* recognize that Jesus' Nazarene origin connects him with Isaiah 11:1?

That they do not, in fact, make this association can be determined from 21:46. There, Matthew relates that the Pharisees "feared the multitudes, because they held him to be a prophet" (ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον). The passage is Matthean, and the εἰς προφήτην is indefinite. Here, ἔχειν with εἰς and the double accusative means to "regard (someone) as (something)."[50] The crowds, therefore, "regard Jesus as a prophet." Rather than suppose that this is a contradiction, it is preferable to assume that he is making explicit what he has already stated at 21:11, namely, that the crowds regard Jesus as *a* prophet. The proximity of the remark to 21:11 is hardly fortuitous, especially given the changes Matthew has made to Mark 12:12.[51] It becomes even worthier of remark when it is recognized that this is the only time Jesus is described as a prophet (vs. 14:5 and 21:26 of the Baptist).

It is just possible, however, that 21:46 refers to "the prophet like Moses." Allison argues that occasionally "a prophet" is regarded as having a definite sense. He cites 1QS IX:11 and observes that Deut 18:15 and 18 are also anarthrous.[52] The problem with applying this observation to Matthew 21:46, however, is that the crowds' remarks about John the Baptist are also anarthrous. Matthew twice states that the crowds hold that John was a prophet (14:5; 21:26). Like 21:46, both of these passages are Matthean. What is more, they have a

[48] Cf. Acts 2:30.
[49] Allison, *The New Moses*, 249.
[50] BDF 157(3,5).
[51] Sand (*Gesetz*, 141-142) tries to draw the notion of the Prophet out of the parable of the Vineyard, but this is quite unlikely, simply because, as Michel Hubaut (*La Parabole des Vignerons Homicides* [Paris: Gabalda, 1976] 44) has established, Matthew's replacement of ἔσχατον (Mark 12:6) by ὕστερον (Matt 21:37) seems calculated precisely to eliminate any such eschatological implications.
[52] Allison, *The New Moses*, 78#183.

grammatical form that is identical to 21:46 except that ὡς is used with the accusative predicate instead of εἰς.[53] Both have the same meaning.[54] How, then, is John to be differentiated from Jesus? Surely, Matthew does not envision two eschatological prophets. If he did see 21:11 as a reference to the eschatological prophet, one would have expected him not to use the anarthrous προφήτην at 21:46, precisely because of its similarity to the crowds' description of John at 21:26 just twenty verses earlier.

All told, therefore, it is preferable to conclude that at 21:11 there is no reference to the eschatological prophet, at least on the crowds' part. Whether Matthew intends his readers to make the connection, of course, cannot be categorically excluded.

D *The Violent Fate of the Prophets*

If the crowds do not see in Jesus the eschatological prophet, why then has Matthew introduced this designation at 21:11 and 21:46? There are several compelling reasons. The first is to signal Jesus' relation to Jerusalem, and the second to anticipate Jerusalem's relation to him. In the former instance, Matthew has re-arranged the account of the Triumphal Entry to highlight Jesus' very first action in Jerusalem—the cleansing of the temple. Unlike Mark's gospel, which has Jesus enter the temple only to look around and depart for Bethany, Matthew has Jesus purify the temple immediately. As soon as the crowds identify Jesus as prophet, he cleanses the temple: "the crowds said, 'This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee.' And Jesus entered the temple of God and drove out all who sold and bought in the temple…"(21:11-12). It would be difficult to unite the two ideas more closely. Jesus' very first action after being acclaimed prophet is to perform a prophetic act in the temple.

As Aune has demonstrated in his discussion of Mark's version of the temple cleansing, Jesus' cleansing must be construed as a prophetic action.[55] Typically, prophetic actions have two components: the report of the symbolic action, and its interpretation.[56] Both are present in Matthew's narrative. Jesus' eviction of the buyers and

[53] 14:5 ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.
21:26 φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην.
21:46 ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

[54] Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 246.

[55] Aune, *Prophecy*, 161-3 following the analysis of Schnider, *Prophet*, 83-4. Cf. also DA III 133-5.

[56] Aune, *Prophecy*, 161.

sellers and his overturning of the tables constitute the symbolic action. Jesus provides the interpretation (and his implicit authorization) by citing scripture: "It is written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer'; but you make it a den of robbers" (Is 56:7; cf. Jer 7:11).

Aune has detected in Mark's version "a symbolic overthrow of the temple that would be fulfilled in the future,"[57] and such an import also likely underlies Matthew's version. Given that Matthew's gospel has at 22:7 the clearest allusion of any of the gospels to the destruction of Jerusalem, the judgemental significance of Jesus' actions is patent. His deeds portend the destruction of the temple and the city as a whole. That the final words of Jesus' public ministry are a woe over the city itself (23:37-39) cannot help but consolidate this impression. Matthew's crowds, therefore, identify Jesus as a prophet so that he can, in his very first action, predict the temple's—and Jerusalem's—coming destruction. Jesus's departure from the city immediately after cleansing the temple (21:17) signifies that he has prophetically condemned both the temple and the city, and abandoned them to their fate.

The consequence of Jesus' prophetic treatment of Jerusalem is that Jerusalem treats him as a prophet. In fact, such an identification is made by the evangelist prior to the Triumphal Entry, implicitly at least, in the parallelism between Jesus and John the Baptist. The fact that John is popularly accounted a prophet at 21:26 and Jesus one at 21:46 suggests a deliberate attempt to parallel the two on the part of the evangelist. This parallelism has often been noted in other elements of their respective ministries, such as the use of identical exhortations, and is, indeed, a characteristic feature of Matthew's portrayal as a whole.[58]

The decisive feature of this parallelism, however, is the fate of Jesus and John. Each dies a violent death. John's death assumes special significance in this regard since Matthew's introduction of προφήτης at 14:5 (against Mark)[59] transmutes the Baptist's death into a prophet's death. John's death, in turn, prefigures Jesus' own.[60] Instead of placing John's body in a tomb as happens in Mark (Mark 6:29), John's disciples come and announce the Baptist's death to Jesus, whereupon Jesus withdraws. The entire episode is calculated to

---

[57] Aune, *Prophecy*, 162.

[58] Allison (*The New Moses*, 137-8) provides a helpful list of parallels between the two. Cf. Meier, "John," 386-402; Trilling, "Täufertradition," 382-386; Yamasaki, *John the Baptist*, 144-45. For a dissenting view, cf. Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 90, 107.

[59] Cf. Mark 6:14-29, and note Matthew's omission of Mark 6:20.

[60] Meier, "John," 400.

foreshadow Jesus' own impending fate. As Meier well puts it, "when the Baptist's disciples 'announce' John's death to Jesus, they are announcing Jesus' death as well."[61] This correlation, in fact, seems to be the whole point of the parallelism between the two—to bring out the fate of John and Jesus as prophets of Israel.[62]

The same theme is clearly in evidence at 17:12. Matthew retains Mark's basic idea concerning the Baptist (ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν cf. Mark 9:13), but goes on to speak of the suffering of the Son of Man: οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. John's and Jesus' suffering are again set side by side, with the initial allusion to John's death illustrating what Matthew means by πάσχειν with respect to Jesus.

Why then has Matthew introduced this concern with the violent fates of Jesus and John the Baptist into his gospel? In all likelihood he is drawing upon the topos of the "violent fate of the prophets," the notion that the disobedient people of Israel put all true prophets to death. The concept is first expressed at Nehemiah 9:26—"Nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against thee and cast thy law behind their back and killed thy prophets, who had warned them in order to turn them back to thee, and they committed great blasphemies"—and grew to be very influential.[63] Features of this pattern can be seen to underlie a number of canonical and extra-canonical writings, and by the time of the First Century CE, it appears that the topos had gained wide currency.[64]

Odil Steck, in an extensive monograph devoted to the subject, isolates a distinctive pattern associated with "the violent fate of the prophets:"

A Israel, prior to the exile, was unremittingly disobedient
B Yahweh patiently sent prophets to his people to urge them to repent.

---

[61] Meier, "John," 400; Schönle, *Jesus*, 147; Trilling, "Täufertradition," 274; Wink, *John the Baptist*, 27.

[62] Meier, "John," 402; Trilling, "*Täufertradition*", 274.

[63] Hans Kessler, *Die theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1970) 232. On the motif in general, see J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes* II 287-317; H. A. Fischel, "Martyr and Prophet," *JQR* 37 (1946-1947) 265-280; H. J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde" in *idem, Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950) 126-143.

[64] Cf. 1 Kgs 19:10,14; 2 Chr 24:19-22; Jer 2:30; 26:20-23; cf. 2 Chr 36:14-16 as well as Jub 1:12; MartIs 5:12-13. The pseudepigraphical Lives of the Prophets (first quarter of the First Century C.E.?) mentions the deaths of six prophets, but does not stress the corporate involvement of Israel in their death, except in the case of Jeremiah (cf. LivPro 1:1—Isaiah; 2:1—Jeremiah; 3:1—Ezekiel; 6:2—Micah; 7:2—Amos; 23:1—Zechariah son of Jehoiada).

C Israel either refused to heed the prophets or killed them
D Yahweh punished them by sending them into exile.[65]

Several additional stages addressed the situation of the Second Temple period:

E Israel was again presented with the option of repentance and obedience to the law
F1 If they repented, Yahweh would restore them to the land
F2 If they repented, Yahweh would judge Israel's enemies.[66]

Not surprisingly, perhaps, features of this topos can be discerned in a number of early Christian documents,[67] most notably in Q.[68] Despite Matthew's evident reliance on Q, it has been argued that the violent fate of the prophets is little emphasized in his gospel. Aune, for one, remarks that Matthew does not develop the idea, except to "contribute some embellishments to the material he used from Mark and Q."[69] Closer scrutiny of the gospel, however, demonstrates that the evangelist's contribution amounts to considerably more than simply "embellishments."[70]

A case in point is 5:12, the final macarism in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus blesses those persecuted on his account, "for so", he says, "men persecuted the prophets who were before you" (οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν). This passage is derived from Q (cf. Luke 6:23), but the reference to persecution (διώκω) is likely from Matthew's hand, as it is characteristic of his vocabulary and figures prominently in 5:10-11, verses without parallel in Luke.[71] Because

---

[65] O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967) 63-4.

[66] Steck, *Geschick*, 184-6. As Steck has analysed this topos extensively, there is no need to reproduce his findings here in any detail.

[67] In the NT, cf. 1 Thes 2:14-15; Rom 11:3; Heb 11:37; Acts 7:52.

[68] For a discussion of the motif in Q, see Marie-Louise Gubler, *Die frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu: Eine motivgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1977) 10-27, and, more recently, Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 165-207.

[69] Aune, *Prophecy*, 158. Contrast Trilling's remarks (*Israel*, 80): "Ein zweites 'Dogma' bei Matthäus ist das der Prophetenmorde."

[70] On the "violent fate of the prophets" in Matthew, cf. Steck, *Geschick*, 289-316, as well as DA I 465-6; Garland, *Intention*, 179-187; Douglas R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: University Press, 1967) 137-141.

[71] The verb διώκω occurs 6 times in Matthew, 3 times in Luke, and not at all in Mark. If 5:10-11 was not written by Matthew, the verses have certainly been edited by him. Cf. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 26.

διώκω is a general term, like the English word "persecution," it can encompass anything from verbal abuse to murder.[72] The terms used in Luke 6:22-23, however, preclude the possibility of murder. "Their fathers," by implication, only hated, excluded, and reproached the prophets, and cast out their name as evil. Luke (or Q) at this point says nothing that would suggest that "their fathers" killed the prophets. Matthew deploys the word διώκω precisely because, implicitly at least, it allows him to include the violent fate of the prophets (just as he does, for instance, at 23:34-39).

The fate of the prophets has also been introduced into the allegory of the wedding banquet (22:1-14 // Luke 14:16-24). When some of the prospective guests were presented with the invitation, they seized the king's servants and "treated them shamefully and killed them"(Matt 22:6). This verse is not paralleled in Luke's version, and appears to have been introduced to produce a correspondence with Matthew's parable of the vineyard, where the servants are also mistreated and put to death (21:34-36). In each parable, Matthew has changed the singular "servant" (δοῦλος), present in Q and Mark respectively, to "servants" (δοῦλοι). As the plural δοῦλοι is used in the LXX of God's prophets,[73] it is hardly an unwarranted inference to find them in these two parables. In fact, the two sets of "servants" in the parable of the vineyard can even be taken to represent the former and latter prophets.[74]

The same concern probably underlies Matthew's addition of "Jeremiah" to the list of prophets at 16:14. Here Jesus has just asked his disciples, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?"(16:13), to which the disciples reply, "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." Their answer is similar to that found in Mark, except for the addition of Jeremiah. M. J. J. Menken has argued that Jeremiah is included here because he is "the prophet who in his own rejection and suffering announces the rejection and suffering of the Messiah."[75] Mencken further notes that, in Matthew, as opposed to Mark, Elijah and John the Baptist are figures of prophetic suffering.[76] At 14:5, in the account of John's

[72] Paul's assertion at Acts 22:4 makes this correlation explicit: ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου.

[73] Cf. Jer 7:25-26: ἐξαπέστειλα πρὸς ὑμᾶς πάντας τοὺς δούλους μου τοὺς προφήτας. Cf. Jer 25:4; Prov 9:3.

[74] Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 621. For other alternatives, cf. DA III 197#21.

[75] M. J. J. Menken, "The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew (Mt 2,17; 16,14; 27,9)," *ETL* 60 (1984) 24.

[76] Menken, "Jeremiah," 2-22.

death, Matthew has the crowds call John the Baptist a prophet. And, since Jesus identifies John the Baptist with Elijah in the first gospel (17:11-13), Elijah too, suffers a prophet's death.[77]

Modifications such as these, therefore, hardly constitute "embellishments." Matthew has altered his sources in such a way as to evoke the theme of salvation history, and more particularly, the fate of the prophets at the hands of their countrymen. Matthew's emphasis on the prophetic character and violent deaths of the Baptist and Jesus certainly indicates that he wished to align both with this tradition.[78] As this tradition has its origin in Nehemiah, Matthew evidently regards it as topos that has been mediated by the Hebrew Scriptures.

E *The Crowds and Jesus the Prophet*

What then are the implications of the crowds' use of προφήτης? Until Jesus' arrest, their response to the prophets appears favourable. Their belief that John and Jesus were prophets consistently holds the leaders in check, the latter "fearing" the ὄχλοι (14.5; 21:26, 46). For most of the gospel, therefore, their response is one that is favourable toward Jesus and the Baptist. They recognize the prophetic character of the ministry of both, and are, instinctively at least, far closer than their leaders to a true appreciation of Jesus and his Elijah.

For this reason, it is mistaken to suppose that the crowds' designation of Jesus (and John) is "incorrect."[79] While the appellation hardly discloses the full spectrum of Jesus' identity, their remark is accurate. Allison rightly observes that "the crowds which hail Jesus as the Son of David speak the truth while those in the guilty capital hold no opinion."[80] The crowds' identification here and at 21:46 helps to establish more fully the correlation that Matthew develops between John the Baptist and Jesus. Further, it helps to situate Jesus in the continuum of the prophets of Israel, as well as in the future

---

[77] To these examples can be added Matthew 23:34-36, which situates Christian prophets within this continuum. See further, Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 68-73; Steck, *Geschick*, 28-34.

[78] Edwards (*Sign*, 98) finds an interesting correlation between Jesus and Jonah (Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου 12:39 Matthew's addition): "the mention of the fact that Jonah was a prophet in that pericope where Matthew stresses the suffering of Jonah and Jesus . . . would point to the passion of Jesus as the signficant element in the Jonah comparison."

[79] Kingsbury ("Comprehension," 374) claims that the crowds "incorrectly" identify Jesus as a prophet.

[80] Allison, *The New Moses*, 314. Allison (pp. 311-14) provides a detailed refutation of Kingsbury's position.

continuum of Jesus' own prophets (23:34). Finally, as was just shown, the crowds' identification sets the stage for Jesus' prophetic condemnation of the temple and cult.

Their description of Jesus as a prophet, however, is ominous in other respects. In announcing the arrival of "Jesus the prophet" to the people of Jerusalem, the crowds announce to Jerusalem the arrival of yet another prophet sent from God. And Jerusalem, as the gospel makes clear, is the city that kills the prophets and stones those sent to her (23:37). This prophet-killing motif has already been established in the gospel. The stirring of the city at 21:10 calls to mind a previous episode where the city of Jerusalem was shaken, and where an attempt was made on Jesus' life.[81]

In the two passages, the entire city of Jerusalem is confronted with the advent of its king, and on both occasions, attempts are made on Jesus' life. The chief difference between the two attempts is that the second proves to be successful. Thus, the crowds' proclamation of Jesus as a prophet is portentous. The very frequency of the term—three times in chapter 21—can be seen as anticipatory of Jesus' death. The crowds unwittingly initiate the "violent fate of the prophets" by identifying Jesus as a prophet to Jerusalem.[82] Horrifically, their proclamation of Jesus as prophet simply represents the first act.[83] As the next chapter will make clear, their enthusiasm for Jesus holds their leaders in check for only so long, and then the crowds are suborned by them for the final act, when Jerusalem once more becomes the city that kills the prophets. Initially, then, the crowds' involvement is innocent, and actually forestalls Jesus' arrest. It is the leadership of Israel that is guilty, just as it was the leadership—Herod, in this case—who were responsible for the Baptist's murder. Eventually, though, the leadership prevails, and the crowds become enmeshed in Jesus' prophetic death.

The crowds' identification of Jesus as a prophet, therefore, functions as a bridge that connects their acclamation of Jesus with their later repudiation of him. The topos of the violent fate of the prophets explains why this should be the case. In Matthew's view, the people of Israel have always welcomed the prophets of God, only to spurn them; and the crowds, once they have come under the influence their leaders and Jerusalem, begin to conform to the people

---

[81] Verse 21:10 (καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις) has more than a few similarities with 2:3 (ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεύς Ἡρῴδης ἐταράχθη καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ).

[82] Schönle, *Jesus*, 147.

[83] Cf. Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 63.

of Israel of old. The malign influence of their Jewish leadership (symbolized in some measure by Jerusalem itself) eventually brings the crowds under its sway, and promotes their transformation into prophet-killers.

This observation may help to account for the pronounced denouement that results when the crowds acclaim Jesus as the Davidic messiah, and then proceed to describe him simply as *a* prophet. Their description of Jesus as *a* prophet helps to qualify what they mean by the Son of David. Instead of viewing him as a divine figure, Matthew has the crowds regard Jesus as a human anointed by God, who had been imparted teaching and healing authority to minister to and to lead Israel.[84] They have enough insight to recognize Jesus as messianic Son of David and prophet, but lack the understanding to recognize him as the divine Lord or Son of God.

The denouement also arises out of the contrary emphases Matthew wishes to convey. These emphases merge in the Triumphal Entry, which is a pivotal hinge point within the gospel narrative, where one topos of Israel is replaced with another. On the one hand, it is essential for Matthew's depiction of Jesus as the shepherd of Israel and Son of David that the people recognize him as such. He was sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, and the lost sheep flock to him, and instinctively do recognize that he was sent to them. The Triumphal Entry represents the culmination of this ministry: it is the epiphany of Jesus to Israel, the symbolic moment where Jesus' true identity is formally and publicly proclaimed to all Israel. Matthew's crowds bring this about.

On the other hand, Jesus is put to death by his own people, just as the prophets before him were. Here Matthew evokes the established topos of the violent fate of the prophets to account for the anomaly of the Messiah's death. Once more, the crowds are conscripted to play the role, even though it is contrary to the one they have just played. After identifying him as a prophet, they go on to assume complicity in his prophet's death. Thus, unlike the children in the marketplace, Matthew's crowds dance when the pipes are played and mourn when the wailing begins. It is Matthew in each case who sets the tune.

---

[84] Here, Bar Kochba would serve as a useful analogue. On the contrasting notions of a human versus a divine messiah, see Martin J. Selman, "Messianic Mysteries" in Satterthwaite et al. *Lord's Anointed*, 292-95.

F *Conclusion*

From the foregoing, it can be concluded that Matthew shows little discernible interest in the notion of the eschatological prophet, and it is probable that this idea is not in view at 21:11. Instead, Matthew uses the designation "prophet" to invoke the established scriptural topos of the "violent fate of the prophets." The crowds' identification of Jesus as a prophet situates him within the continuum of the prophets, and adumbrates his death. Thus, the reluctance of many scholars to take the crowds' designation of Jesus as ὁ προφήτης christologically is well founded. Matthew's use of the term is not chiefly intended to contribute to his Christology, but to evoke salvation history. He identifies both Jesus and John as prophets to situate them in—albeit as the culmination of—the long line of prophets sent to Israel.

For these reasons one might justly regard the Triumphal Entry as something of a narrative "hinge," joining the two disparate qualities of the crowds' behaviour: the designation "prophet" joins the Triumphal Entry to the Passion Narrative. Verse 21:11 plays a cardinal role in the Triumphal Entry, and one that ultimately stands in opposition to Son of David. On the one hand, "Son of David" in the crowds' mouths encapsulates much of the interaction between the crowds and Jesus prior to the Triumphal Entry. On the other hand, the crowds' use of "prophet" anticipates the Passion narrative and suggests that the very moment of the crowds' clearest perception of Jesus' identity is immediately followed by a movement away from it. As soon as they get close, they begin to withdraw again. Just how complete their withdrawal is will be examined in more detail in the next chapter.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TEN

A *The* Volte-Face *of the Crowds*

The following chapter will examine the place of the crowds in the Passion Narrative. Its chief purpose will be to consider the nature of Matthew's editorial modifications. Has he attempted to absolve the crowds of responsibility for Jesus' death, to emphasize their involvement, or neither?

For those who argue that the portrayal of the crowds in Matthew is uniformly favourable, the part played by the ὄχλοι in the Passion Account is problematic. Minear and Saldarini, for instance, attempt to posit a different crowd or crowds—non-Galilean crowds associated with the chief priests and elders of the people.[1] This is difficult. Are the crowds mentioned at 22:33 (ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ), who are described as raptly listening to Jesus in the temple,[2] to be construed as Galileans as well? Instead, even if Matthew does not make the connection explicit, it would seem better to identify the crowds at 22:33 with those at 26:55. Such, at least, is the implication of Jesus' words: "Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs to capture me? Day after day I sat in the temple teaching and you did not seize me" (26:55).

This correlation is also supported by Matthew's indifferent use of the plural and singular to characterize the crowds that come to arrest Jesus (26:47 ὄχλος πολύς // Mark 14:43 ὄχλος; 26:55 τοῖς ὄχλοις no //).[3] On the one occasion where Matthew apparently depicts a crowd distinct from the masses (9:23,25), he uses the singular in both instances, emphasizing thereby the singular character of the group.[4] One would anticipate that if Matthew were intent on distinguishing this one group from the crowds as a whole, he would have made this same distinction here.[5] One can further add that Matthew moves

---

[1] Minear, "Crowds," 35; Blomberg (*Matthew*, 412) would distinguish "Galilean crowds" from "Jerusalem natives," while Saldarini (*Christian-Jewish Community*, 38) would associate one crowd with the arrest and another with the trial before Pilate.

[2] It is presupposed from 21:23 to 24:1 that Jesus is in the temple. Verse 21:26 also presupposes an audience composed of the crowds—otherwise the leaders would not have been afraid to reply to Jesus concerning John's baptism.

[3] Brown, *Death* I 282.

[4] Both 9:23 and 9:25 are editorial.

[5] Obviously, the point cannot be pressed too far.

from singular to plural throughout the Passion Narrative. If a single crowd (or two separate crowds) were in view, one might expect him to use the singular throughout. Instead, he continues to vacillate between the singular and the plural, a vacillation that is entirely typical of his portrayal of the crowds throughout the gospel.[6]

In addition, the supposition of a separate crowd or crowds in the Passion Narrative seems to be entirely predicated on the presupposition that a change in the crowds' behaviour must signal a different crowd. Van Tilborg appears to follow Minear's line of argumentation when he claims that "it is not permissible to harmonize the ὄχλοι mentioned in Mt 9,33,12:23; 21:9 with the ὄχλοι of Mt 27,20 and then continue to assume a certain development."[7] Yet, why should development necessarily preclude a change of heart?[8] Peter's understanding of Jesus grows (16:17-20), but he still goes on to deny Jesus. The very fact that this crowd is coupled with Judas, Jesus' disciple, at 26:47 suggests that the assumption is unnecessary. Need we posit a different Judas on the a priori assumption that one of Jesus' disciples would never betray him, or a different Peter on the assumption that Peter the "rock" would never deny him? The coupling of the crowds with Judas, therefore, is an apt one. Both forego their onetime association with Jesus and defect to the Jewish leadership.

If these are indeed the same crowds as in the rest of the gospel, what reasons does Matthew offer for this change? One essential consideration is the involvement of the Jewish leadership. While Matthew does not add substantially to Mark's account in this respect, he repeatedly indicates that the crowds are largely pawns in the whole proceeding, ready tools used to accomplish their leaders' purpose.[9] The "chief priests and elders of the people" first begin plotting to kill Jesus at 26:3. They go on to orchestrate the crowds' arrest of Jesus (26:47) and, in a Matthean addition, the reader learns that "all" of the chief priests and elders take counsel and resolve to put Jesus to death (ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν 27:1). Finally, in a further Matthean addition, they deliberately persuade the crowds to ask for Jesus to be put to death (27:20).[10]

---

[6] The same vacillation is evident in the trial sequence: Matthew refers to the crowd at 27:15 and 27:24 and to the crowds at 27:20.

[7] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 159.

[8] Davies and Allison (DA III 588#42) draw attention to "the change in attitude of the people towards Jeremiah in Par. Jer 9.1-3. They finally stone him."

[9] So too DA III 588.

If Matthew does not say precisely how this persuasion was accomplished, he does provide a few evocative hints.[11] The first is that, prior to the arrest, the last speech Jesus addresses to the crowds (23:1 no //) is a warning about hypocritical leadership. It little matters that it is the scribes and Pharisees whom he reproaches here—there is no doubt that the chief priests and elders also fit the bill (cf. 28:13; cf. 27:62). That they are chief priests and elders *of the people*, as Matthew repeatedly tells us before the trial (26:3,47; 27:1), indicates that they are capable of using their authority and influence as the authorized leaders of the people to subvert the people. The evil shepherds use their appointed position to mislead their flock, and the flock, in spite of having been warned, foolishly follows.[12]

Matthew also accounts for the defection of the crowds and Jesus' arrest by appealing to Scripture. Verse 26:56 seems to allude to a divine framework governing these events—τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.[13] The most notable feature of this verse is Matthew's addition of τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν to Mark's citation. Matthew's usage is distinctive here in that he makes ὅλον refer to an event.[14] Judging from his use of a similar expression at 1:22 (where 1:22, 23 refer to the circumstances preceding Jesus' birth of 1:18-21), ὅλον here pertains to the arrest of Jesus.[15] It likely, however, has a broader signification, encompassing the entire Passion Account, of which the arrest is just the beginning.[16] Senior expresses this well: "in

---

[10] Carter, *Matthew*, 240; Davies, *Matthew*, 195.

[11] Significantly, Matthew does not provide a rationale for Judas' betrayal either.

[12] See further DA III 593 and Senior, *Matthew*, 170.

[13] The passage is best taken as Matthew's recasting of Mark 14:49 (see Schulz, *Stunde*, 170, Senior, *Passion*, 142-148; Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Auspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965) 42), though it is not of fundamental significance either way, since 26:56 can be taken as a final remark by Jesus, or an editorial remark by Matthew. Of these two possibilities, the latter is more probable; Suhl remarks that "dies ist eine deutliche Reflexion des Erzählers im Stile der übrigen Reflexionszitate (Suhl, *Funktion*, 42; see too, Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Prabhu, *Formula*, 30; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 34-35; Senior, *Passion*, 152, 154#3). On the relation of 26:56 to the *Reflexionszitate* see: Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Prabhu, *Formula*, 26-31; Strecker, *Weg*, 49#2. For the purposes of this discussion it is immaterial whether 26:56 is formally regarded as one of the *Reflexionszitate* or not, since in function, if not in form, it is closely allied to them.

[14] For this distinctive usage see: Prabhu, *Formula*, 28; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 35.

[15] Cf. the related τοῦτο at 21:4, which refers back to the events of 21:1-3.

[16] Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 790; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Senior, "Lure," 109.

the act of betrayal and the deliverance into the hands of sinners the entire Passion is defined."[17]

Both the immediate and the broader application of the phrase have a bearing on the crowds as such. Matthew's treatment of them here and in the later Passion Narrative makes it abundantly clear that their actions are to be explained as the fulfilment of scripture.[18] Like Mark, he refers to Jesus' hour "being at hand" (ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα 26:45 // Mark 14:41), but goes on to add "in that hour" (εν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ 26:55) precisely at the moment when Jesus addresses the crowds.[19] The effect is to provide an implicit answer to the question that Jesus poses to the crowds—why is it that they did not seize him in the Temple?—it was because the fore-ordained hour had not yet arrived. Now, however, with Judas' arrival, the hour has also arrived, and in full accordance with the scriptures Jesus is seized by the crowds and "betrayed into the hand of sinners."[20]

Thus, in the first gospel, it is God's foreordained economy that ultimately helps to account for the disposition of the crowds. Both their receptivity to Jesus and their later repudiation of him become understandable within the context of God's divine plan. Their reactions simply reflect God's timing and God's purposes. Matthew indicates that Jesus is well aware of the fact, which is why, at 26:54, he rebukes the disciples for using swords. The moment had arrived, the time for the Scriptures to be fulfilled, and Jesus would have nothing interfere with their fulfilment.[21] God's plan, as reflected in αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν, must transpire in God's time. In Matthew's gospel it does, and under the influence of the Jewish leaders the crowds join with Judas and arrest Jesus.

---

[17] Senior, *Passion*, 154; DA III 516. This can also be inferred from the relative scarcity of *Reflexionszitate* in the actual Passion Account (cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 176), which effectively places more emphasis on this passage and its relation to the Passion.

[18] It goes without saying that the role of the ὄχλοι is but one strand of the nexus of events to which ὅλον refers. Nevertheless, the fact that Jesus addresses these remarks to the crowds is telling.

[19] In Matthew, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ is only used once, at 18:1, to indicate a temporal transition, with no previous reference to ὥρα. Otherwise, the phrase occurs most frequently in healing accounts (8:13; 9:22; 15:28; 17:18), and indicates that the healing took place immediately. At 10:19 "in that hour" refers back to 10:18 and the moment when the disciples would be dragged before governors and kings to give testimony.

[20] Note Matthew's use of ἐγγίζω to signify both the arrival of Judas (26:46) and the arrival of Jesus' ὥρα (26:45). When one has arrived so has the other. Cf. Brown, *Death*, I 245.

[21] Frank Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories* (New York: Paulist, 1986) 97.

B *The Crowds in the Barabbas Episode (27:15-26)*

After their involvement in Jesus' arrest, the crowds come to the fore only in the Barabbas pericope (27:15-26).[22] There is a general measure of agreement among exegetes that this pericope consists of Matthew's reworking of Mark's account, with the possible addition of traditional material.[23] From the outset of the pericope, it is apparent that Matthew has made some broad changes to Mark's account of the crowd's behaviour, and that these changes do not at all palliate the involvement of the crowds. If anything, they accentuate the crowds' responsibility.

One way that Matthew has stressed the crowds' complicity is through continually emphasizing their capacity to choose. There is no doubt that the element of choice also figures in Mark's narrative, but Matthew makes the question of choice explicit, and he continues to dwell on it.[24] Verses 27:16 and 27:17, for instance, both have textual variants that read Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν.[25] While the textual support for these readings is far from considerable, there is evidence in Origen and elsewhere that this variant was early, and may have been suppressed for reasons of reverence.[26] If the variant is original, however, then the choice presented to the crowds becomes even more pronounced. They can have the Jesus "called Messiah" or Jesus Barabbas, "the brigand."

---

[22] X. Leon-Dufour ("Mt et Mc dans le Récit de la Passion," *Bib* 40 (1959) 684-696) has attempted to argue for a common "récit plus ancien" behind Matthew and Mark, but his view needlessly multiplies hypotheses. See Senior's criticisms of such a supposition in "The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew" in Didier, *L'Evangile*, 353#36. By contrast, Nils Dahl's ("The Passion Narrative in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 42-43) study shows how Matthew's Passion account, while having Mark as its sole written source, could also have been influenced by the oral traditions of Matthew's church environment. Raymond Brown (*Death* I 60-63) has suggested an alternative source "a source that reflects popular dramatization through storytelling" (p. 60).

[23] On 27:15-26, see Brown, *Death I* 787-861; Dahl, "Passion," 49; Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 46. Trilling (*Israel*, 66) observes that "innerhalb des Passionsberichtes hat Matthäus an dem Stück 27,15-26 stärker gearbeitet als an den anderen." His evaluation ought, however, to be tempered in part by Senior's (*Passion*, 235#1) criticism of his method. Senior faults Trilling for his failure to treat the passage in light of the Passion Narrative as a whole.

[24] S. G. F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Batsford, 1968) 145; F. W. Burnett, *Testament*, 407; Dahl, "Passion", 49; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 205-206; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 411.

[25] Verse 27:17 has Ἰησοῦν [τὸν] Βαραββᾶν.

[26] For a more thorough discussion, see Metzger, *Textual*, 56. There Metzger quotes Origen as discounting the reading because "in the whole range of the scriptures we know that no one who is a sinner [is called] Jesus."

Even if the variant is not original, Matthew still gives prominence to the crowds' capacity to choose. Verse 27:17 follows Mark (Mark 15:9) in its use of θέλω, except that Matthew makes this a choice between Jesus and Barabbas rather than simply a decision to release Jesus. Where Mark has only "'Do you want me to release for you the King of the Jews,'" Matthew has Pilate ask, "'Whom do you want me to release for you, Barabbas or Jesus who is called Christ?'"[27] The question has been reformulated as a clear "either/or" decision.[28] This choice underlies 27:20 and again 27:21 Pilate specifically enquires, τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν. This question, without parallel in Mark, stresses once more the two alternatives given the crowds. As Gundry observes, Matthew "never seems to tire of reiterating the choice between Barabbas and Jesus."[29] And when the crowds finally do decide, they choose Barabbas.[30]

This emphasis on choice is also evident from a consideration of Matthew's vocabulary. At 27:15, for instance, Matthew changes Mark's αὐτοῖς (Mark 15:6) to ὄχλῳ,[31] and then replaces παρῃτοῦντο (15:6) with ἤθελον, stressing thereby the crowd's capacity to choose.[32] The word θέλω occurs again in 27:17 (// Mark 15:9), and a third time in 27:21. The result, as Brown nicely puts it, is that Matthew has produced an "absolutely consistent vocabulary."[33] The crowd is presented with a choice three times, and they consistently fail to choose Jesus. This threefold rejection of Jesus has, moreover, suggestive echoes of Peter's threefold denial of Jesus.

---

[27] Mark 15:9 reads: θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων as against Matthew 27:17: τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, [Ιησοῦν τὸν] Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν.

[28] Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 47. As part of this *Entweder-Oder*, Matthew has also remodelled Mark's framework so that Jesus and Barabbas are not discussed alternately, but as a pair. See Senior, *Passion*, 241.

[29] Gundry, *Matthew*, 563; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904) 137.

[30] Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 47. Davies and Allison (DA III 585) note that if ἐπίσημον (27:15) is to be translated as "notorious," then this "translation makes the crowd's choice all the more odious."

[31] Probably, as Senior suggests (*Passion*, 236), this reflects dependence on Mark 15:8.

[32] Gundry, *Matthew*, 560; Trilling, *Israel*, 73; Senior (*Passion*, 236) remarks that, "the tonality between the two words is decidedy different. In a sense 'to choose' (θέλω) is prior to and determinative of what one 'demands' or 'requests' (αἰτέω) . . . the verb θέλω is more subjective and 'decisional'—it refers to a person's choice or desire. The verb αἰτέω is used as the expression of that choice."

[33] Brown, *Death* I 795#13.

Matthew further inculpates the crowds by reducing the overall turbulence of the scene. Mark's πάλιν ἔκραξαν is changed to λέγουσιν (Mark 15:13 // Matt 27:22),[34] making the exchange between the crowds and Pilate almost orderly and reasonable.[35] Trilling observes that the proceeding is marked by an ominous rationality,[36] though he does, perhaps, somewhat overstate his case, since he does not really allow for the turbulence at 27:23b and 27:24.[37] Nevertheless, the clamour only breaks out when it appears that the crowds might not get their way. It is particularly ironic that the only time a θόρυβος is about to erupt amongst the crowd is when Pilate is disinclined to kill Jesus, rather than the reverse. This set of affairs marks a profound departure from 26:5 where the chief priests and elders feared "a tumult (θόρυβος) among the people" if they arrested Jesus.

A rational tone is also very much in evidence at 27:20. Here, Matthew relates that the chief priests and elders "persuaded" the crowds (instead of Mark's "stirred them up"). The choice of word may result from Matthew's desire to simplify Mark's rather rare ἀνέσεισαν, but, given the above mentioned *Tendenz*, it would seem warranted to regard the substitution as a theologically motivated alteration.[38] Gundry, however, claims that the substitution actually "lightens the crowd's burden of guilt by making them the victims of evil persuasion."[39] Is this the case? There is no doubt that the chief priests and elders are guilty of misleading the crowds, but their involvement still does not exculpate the crowds.[40] Persuasion implies a reasoned or deliberative process, while Mark's "stirred up," by contrast, suggests an unconsidered, passionate reaction. Surely a *crime*

---

[34] Senior, *Passion*, 240 also mentions "Mark's threatening καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι κτλ (Mark 15:8a)," which Matthew replaces by συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν (27:17), but the "threatening" character of Mark's phrase is, at best, ambiguous.

[35] Cf. Matthew's inclusion of εἶπαν at 27:21. See, as well, Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 385; Trilling, *Israel*, 73.

[36] Trilling (*Israel*, 74) asserts that "Matthäus zeichnet nicht eine tumultarische Volksszene… sondern einen fast nüchternen, klaren, doch gerade deshalb erschreckend kalten, fast gesetzmässig verlaufenden Vorgang. Zwischen Pilatus und dem Volk findet weniger ein dramatisches Ringen um Freigabe und Verurteilung, als ein trockenes Zwiegespräch statt."

[37] Trilling (*Israel*, 73) does, however, recognise these details.

[38] Lagrange, *St. Matthieu*, 522 and Senior, *Passion*, 248#2. Strangely, Senior seems to miss the distinction between πείθω and ἀνασείω. He claims (*Passion*, 248) that "πείθω is a much more common word for 'invite' or 'persuade.'" Yet, πείθω is by no means a "more common word for 'invite,'" as both BAGD and LSJ attest.

[39] Gundry, *Matthew*, 562, and see Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 221#128.

[40] As Hill (*Matthew*, 351) would argue. See Burnett, *Testament*, 407-408, as well.

passionnel is less culpable than one that is, in some degree, premeditated. For this reason, the crowds in Matthew clearly bear more responsibility than they do in Mark's version.

The crowds' responsibility is also greater because what they condone is far graver than it is in Mark. While Mark's crowd is simply stirred up to secure the release of Barabbas (Mark 15:11), Matthew's crowds are persuaded not merely to ask for Barabbas, but "to ask for Barabbas *and destroy Jesus*." To be sure, the idea originates with the chief priests and elders, but the crowds' mere acquiescence to such an act signals a profound change in their disposition.

Matthew has added various other touches that tend to stress the complicity of the crowd. The historic present is used at 27:22b, λέγουσιν πάντες σταυρωθήτω, thus giving emphasis to their remark,[41] even if the crowds' use of the passive subjunctive σταυρωθήτω is probably not, as has sometimes been proposed, an echo of juridical language.[42] The characteristic inclusion of "all" brings out the involvement of the entire crowd here,[43] while the passive "Let him be crucified" can be taken as an effort to devolve Pilate's guilt onto the crowds instead.[44] The shift back to the imperfect ἔκραζον in verse 23 (vs. ἔκραξαν Mark 15:14) indicates an ongoing action—their demand for Barabbas is in the aorist, but their rejection of Jesus is recurrent.[45] Davies and Allison make the nice observation that ἔκραζον λέγοντες may be designed to echo the crowds' acclamation at 21:9. The crowds who had acclaimed Jesus so emphatically at the Triumphal Entry now round on him and call for his death with equal fervour.[46]

A further notable feature is the use of *oratio recta* on the part of the crowds.[47] Of course, the chief reason it is employed at this juncture is

---

[41] Gundry (*Matthew*, 563) notes that "Matthew reserves the historical present of λέγω for sayings he wants to emphasize." See also Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 94. Mark has the aorist ἔκραξαν (Mark 15:13).

[42] Harrington (*Matthew*, 389,391) suggests that the crowds' response "is phrased in the language of a legal decision."

[43] Senior (*Passion*, 251) relates that "Matthew takes pains to note that the choice of Barabbas over Jesus has been ratified by all the people."

[44] See Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, 435; Gundry, *Matthew*, 564; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 445#115; Strecker, *Weg*, 116; Trilling, *Israel*, 74 (who sees in it only the exculpation of Pilate). Against this view, cf. Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 345. It may also be that Matthew simply used the passive out of force of habit, as Senior urges (*Passion*, 251).

[45] Cf. Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 94, and Gundry (*Matthew*, 564) remarks: "Atypically he turns Mark's aorist into the imperfect to stress that they repeatedly yelled for Jesus' crucifixion."

[46] DA III 589.

[47] The crowds reply to Pilate three times in direct speech: 27:21 Τὸν Βαραββᾶν, 27.22: σταυρωθήτω, 27.23: σταυρωθήτω.

to add to the vividness and intensity of the narrative.[48] Their staccato retorts contrast noticeably with the lengthier queries of Pilate, and also contrast markedly with their earlier acclamations of Jesus.[49] Given the limited number of times the crowds give utterance in the gospel, their remarks here are significant.

To this portrayal must be added Matthew's apparent exculpation of Pilate. Matthew's two additions to Mark's account are particularly decisive in this respect. The first, 27:19, describes how Pilate's wife under the influence of a dream advises Pilate to have nothing to do with that "innocent man"—a caution that he observes.[50] Pilate's seeming openness to divine portents contrasts with the intransigence of the crowds and their leaders, as does his apparent concern for justice. This contrast culminates in Matthew's second addition (27:24),[51] where, in washing his hands, Pilate expressly dissociates himself from the responsibility for Jesus' death.[52]

The most definitive feature of the entire pericope, however, is the moment when the crowds join with the leaders and together as πᾶς ὁ λαός assume collective responsibility for Jesus' death. In Matthew's representation, the crowds are implicated in two ways. First, it is signalled by the change from τοῦ ὄχλου in 27:24 to ὁ λαός in 27:25—a change that signifies that they have implicitly associated themselves with their leaders, or at least with their leaders' intentions. This is a momentous move; after this point the crowds are no longer mentioned in the gospel—only ὁ λαός (27:64) or Ἰουδαίοις (28:15).

---

48 Note how Matthew has compressed Mark's narrative to achieve these same ends.

49 Cf. Miler, *Citations*, 252-53.

50 Brown (*Death* I 789) notes that the contrast between the crowds' choice and the advice proferred by Pilate's wife "intensifies the miscarriage of justice."

51 There is a broad spectrum of opinion concerning the exact provenance of both passages, but it is generally conceded that, even if they are traditional or legendary in background, both show signs of Matthean activity or, as Kilpatrick (*Origins*, 47) opines "strong traces of Matthean style." Trilling, (*Israel*, 67) considers 27:19 traditional, while K. H. Schelkle ("Die 'Selbstverfluchung' Israels nach Matthäus 27,23-25" in Eckert, *Antijudaismus*, 149) deems 27:24-25 traditional. On the other hand, Dahl, "Passion," 50; Gundry, *Matthew*, 565 and Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 47, all see 27:24 as Matthean. Brown's (*Death* I 60-63) supposition of an additional popular source is attractive, particularly in light of the appearance of a similar *Tendenz* in the Gospel of Peter.

52 Gundry (*Matthew*, 564) suggests that ἀπέναντι "demarcates Pilate from the 'crowd.'" In addition, the ἀθῷος and ὄψεσθε deliberately recall the ἀθῷον and ὄψῃ found in the death of Judas pericope at 27:4. The intention is to compare the ὄχλος with Judas (again, cf. 26:47). As Van Tilborg notes (*Leaders*, 94), the "history of the Jewish people has already been prefigured in the story about the blood-money." See Senior, *Passion*, 254-255 as well.

Thus, by Matthew's account, the crowds, in siding with their leaders, relinquish their identity and one-time support for Jesus and choose to follow their leaders instead. The people, and the leaders of the people are symbolically reunited, with the crowds moving under their leaders' sway.

Kingsbury, however, has suggested that "the substitution of the term λαός for ὄχλος at least complies with the general Matthean tendency to place the ὄχλος, as a district group in a neutral or even a positive light."[53] Yet, it is difficult in view of the above-mentioned editorial charges Matthew has made to Mark to see how the substitution mitigates in the least the complicity of the crowds. Rather, the substitution reveals how, in the space of some ten verses, the crowds' position has come more and more to approximate that of their leaders—by 27:25, they have aligned themselves entirely with them. Thus, 27:25 does not spare the crowds, but represents the nadir of their characterization in the gospel.

One indication of the crowds' responsibility emerges from the formula they use at 27:25: τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν. As was shown in Chapter Four above, the formula they employ has its background in the Hebrew Scriptures and is implicitly addressed to God.[54] The λαός, in appropriating this formula, "proclaim before their Lord responsibility for the blood of Jesus."[55] Their remark is momentous because of the prominence accorded to the theme of innocent or righteous blood throughout the gospel. Jesus makes the scribes and Pharisees responsible for "all the righteous blood shed on earth"(23:35), while the chief priests and elders of the people link themselves with the blood money discarded by Judas in the narrative at 27:3-10.[56] And where Pilate attempts to absolve himself through his act of public handwashing, "all the people" do accept responsibility for Jesus' innocent blood.[57] Ignoring Pilate's portentous act, the crowds align themselves with their leadership and its tradition of killing prophets and righteous men.[58]

---

[53] Kingsbury, *Parables,* 26.

[54] See Fitzmyer, "Anti-Semitism," 69#10; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 208-10; Ogawa, *L'histoire,* 220; Senior, *Passion*, 256-8; Trilling, *Israel*, 70-72.

[55] Senior, *Passion*, 257.

[56] Senior, "Lure," 110, 113.

[57] Brown, *Death* I 636-60; Timothy B. Cargal, "'His Blood be Upon Us and Upon Our Children,'" *NTS* 37 (1991) 109-110; Heil, *Death*, 67-70.

[58] Jesus' status as one of the righteous is explicitly introduced in Pilate's wife's warning: "Have nothing to do with that rightous man" (27:19).

A further indication of the crowds' responsibility is furnished by the people's express mention of "our children," a phrase that refers to the next generation, the generation that experienced the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. As Davies and Allison fittingly note, the phrase is aetiological: "an explanation in terms of collective guilt for the destruction of the capital."[59] Such, at least, is the view of the Testament of Levi (16:3-4), which provides a helpful matrix for interpreting this passage:

> A man who by the power of the Most High renews the Law you name 'Deceiver,' and finally you shall plot to kill him, not discerning his eminence; by your wickedness you take innocent blood on your heads. I tell you, on account of him your holy places shall be razed to the ground.

In all likelihood, therefore, Matthew's inculpation of the crowds has been predicated on his understanding of recent history: Because divine judgement came upon Israel, the people of Israel must have been deserving of divine judgement.[60] This fact may help to explain why the narrative in the Passion Account accentuates the complicity of the crowds so unsparingly.[61]

C *The Crowds after the Passion*

Given this almost unrelievedly black portrayal of the crowds, has Matthew completely written them off? There are two reasons to suppose that he has not. The first is the possibility of forgiveness. As the destruction of the first temple and the exile left open the possibility of repentance, this same possibility should not be left out of account for the second destruction.[62] It is noteworthy that the Testament of Levi is not unrelenting in its rejection of the Jewish people,[63] and Matthew is not either.[64] Certainly, it would seem at odds with the message of forgiveness advocated elsewhere in the

---

59 DA III 592.

60 Hans-Jürgen Becker, "Die Zerstörung Jerusalems bei Matthäus und den Rabbinen," *NTS* 44 (1998) 61-62; Brown, *Death* I 62.

61 Levine, "Anti-Judaism," 34.

62 Brown, *Death* I 62. Stanton (*New People*, 254) has drawn attention to the standard pattern of Sin, Exile and Return (S-E-R) to be found in Matthew and other early Christian writings.

63 The Testament (16:5) goes on to say: "You shall have no place that is clean, but you will be as a curse and a dispersion among the nations until he will again have regard for you, and will take you back in compassion."

64 One need only consider Peter's prophesied abandonment of Jesus. Peter forsakes Jesus, even though he has a far more profound understanding of Jesus than the crowds ever do.

gospel (18:21-22). Cargal, for one, has argued that the cry at 27:25 has a double signification—that the crowds' call leaves open the possibility of forgiveness by virtue of Jesus' redemptive blood (26:28).[65]

The other feature that indicates that the crowds are still in contention is the narrative of the guard on the tomb (27:62-66; 28:2-4, 11-15). While the crowds are not specifically mentioned after 27:25, they are apparently alluded to at 27:62-4. There, the chief priests and Pharisees go to Pilate and ask that a guard be posted on Jesus' tomb so that the disciples would not steal the body and tell the "people" (λαός) that Jesus had risen from the dead (27:64).[66] Here, as Dunn notes, "there is a clear distinction between leaders (including Pharisees) and people."[67] Even if the people have joined with their leadership, they are still distinguished from them.

The second part of the account also appears—initially, at least—to presuppose a similar sort of distinction. At the instigation of the chief priests and elders the guards are counselled (and bribed) to claim that Jesus' disciples had stolen his body while they were asleep (28:11-15).[68]. Here the leaders, having styled Jesus as a deceiver, themselves assume the role. Even when they recognize that Jesus has risen from the dead, they buy off the guards (as they had bought off Judas) and promulgate their lie. Verse 28:15 relates that this lie "has been spread among the Jews (παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις) to this day." The passive perfect διεφημίσθη does not allow one to say just who promulgates this lie, but there is no doubt that, initially, it is the chief priests and elders who are the instigators. Thus, it would also be safe to say that initially, at least, it is the people who figure as the dupes of their leaders.

Thus, even though the crowds are no longer explicitly mentioned after the Barabbas episode, it is evident that they continue to be manipulated by their leaders. The narrative suggests that there is a continuing *de facto* distinction between the people and the leaders of the people, even if there is not a terminological one. Even after the symbolic merging at 27:25, Israel is not viewed by Matthew as a single *massa perditionis*. The leaders carry on with their wonted deceit, while the people continue to figure as their uncomprehending victims.

---

[65] Brown, *Death* I 62; Cargal, "Blood," 109-10.

[66] This unusual pairing of the Pharisees with the chief priests is also seen at 21:45.

[67] Dunn, *Partings*, 155.

[68] The narrative as a whole may have been constructed by Matthew, though Brown argues (*Death* II 1301-5) for a derivation from a traditional narrative, which Matthew has introduced into his account.

Do the crowds go on to assume a role in the gospel as transparent figures? The answer to this question will be explored more fully in Chapter Twelve. Before that, however, it is first necessary to consider the crowds' role in the Parable discourse.

D *Conclusion*

The above chapter attempted to determine whether Matthew absolves the crowds of responsibility for Jesus' death, emphasizes their involvement, or neither. It is apparent from the nature and scope of Matthew's changes that he is not simply replicating Mark's account of the crowd's involvement in Jesus' arrest and Passion. He has deliberately intensified the crowds' complicity. The arrest narrative first reveals the crowds' change in disposition, a change paralleled by the behaviour of Jesus' own disciples. Jesus makes clear that their actions are all part of the foreordained plan of God.

Within the Barabbas pericope, the dominant element of Matthew's characterization of the crowds is their culpability. Through a whole series of changes to Mark, Matthew has consistently inculpated them in Jesus' death, until finally at 27:25 they join with their leaders in assuming responsibility for his crucifixion. Having said this, Matthew does not completely condemn the crowds. The gospel leaves open the possibility of forgiveness, especially as the crowds are still distinguished from their leaders after the crucifixion of Jesus, and seen as their dupes.

One key element here is obviously *heilsgeschichtlich*. The events of the Passion comprise the ὅλον mentioned at 26:56 and represent the fulfilment of αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν. For Matthew this fulfilment includes not only the fate of Jesus, but also the role of Israel—including the crowds—in putting Jesus to death. In doing so, and in collectively assuming responsibility for his death, they unwittingly bring one phase of salvation history to a close and make way for the next.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

A *Matthew Chapter 13*

The next component of the gospel to be examined is Matthew's treatment of the crowds in chapter 13. Most of chapter 13 (verses 1-52) consists of one of the so-called "great discourses," the five assemblages of Jesus' teaching in Matthew that end with the formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους—7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1.[1] As the relation of the crowds to these discourses has yet to be examined, our discussion will begin with that. It will then consider the place of the crowds in the first portion of the chapter. The analysis of the crowds up until this point has not taken account of the Parable discourse in its assessment of the crowds' character, even though the discourse is situated in the heart of Jesus' public ministry and in the very midst of the gospel. The justification for this omission will be provided below.

B *The Crowds and the Great Discourses*

Chapter 13 is unique amongst the five "great discourses" in Matthew insofar as it is the only one that is directed at the crowds alone. Yet even if they are the express recipients here, it has been argued that the crowds are also frequently the tacit recipients of other discourses. In fact, the question has provoked more discussion than one would at first anticipate, simply because the presence of the crowds is often regarded as a marker signalling the onset of one of the discourses. Other related markers are the appearance of the disciples (μαθηταί), their approach (προσέρχομαι) to Jesus, and their questioning of him.

---

[1] The designation 'great discourses' is at least as old as Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 261). Luz' s suggestion (*Matthew 1-7*, 455#5) that the formula might derive from Q is perhaps worthy of consideration given Matthew's penchant for repeating phrases from his sources; cf. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 169 -72.
Articles about the discourses and their relation to Matthew's overall structure are legion. For a recent discussion, appraisal and bibliography, see DA I 58-72, though the triadic arrangement they themselves propose does not quite convince either. It is, perhaps, best simply to recognize the presence of the five discourses in Matthew and leave it at that. The very profusion and variety of theories seeking to account for the gospel's structure are themselves compelling arguments against there being one over-arching structural rationale.

To these markers, one can append changes of scene, changes of auditors, as well as the words ὄρος, καθίζω, and λέγω.[2]

For David Barr, the crowds serve as one of the key narrative motifs for establishing the parameters of the discourses. He contends that each discourse "is set off from the preceding narrative either by reference to the crowds or the phrase, "the disciples came to him"—usually both."[3] In fact, Barr finds the crowds mentioned at the beginning of all but the Community discourse (Ch. 18), "where their presence would be inappropriate."[4] T. J. Keegan, for his part, would confine the crowds' presence to only two and a half discourses: the Sermon on the Mount, the Mission discourse, and half of the Parable chapter.[5] It is possible that they figure even less frequently; evidently the solution to this question depends on two factors: first, where the discourses begin, and, second, whether a reference to the presence of the crowds establishes that they were the actual recipients of a discourse.

The first question is a vexed one. Although Matthew makes the endings of the discourses evident by means of his closing formulae, the beginnings of the discourses are less readily discerned.[6] Keegan's attempt to find distinctive markers at the beginning of each discourse is, ultimately, not convincing simply because the markers he posits are overly vague.[7] Matthew does employ certain narrative motifs as signals to his readers, but no one motif is of itself sufficiently unequivocal to serve as a marker.[8] What this means, in effect, is that the beginnings of the discourses continue to be a matter of dispute, as

[2] For a helpful chart of these markers see DA I 411. Davies and Allison do not, however, include changes of auditors as one of these markers.

[3] David Barr, "The Drama of Matthew's Gospel," *TD* 24 (1976) 351.

[4] Barr, "Drama," 358#14.

[5] Keegan, "Formulae," 423-24. Keegan is interested in how the crowds are associated with the discourses. It is not surprising, given his findings, that he relates them to Kingsbury's 'turning point' theory, where, after the parable chapter, Jesus turns away from the crowds and turns to his disciples.

[6] Keegan ("Formulae," 416#6,7) observes that the start of the Missionary discourse has been situated by various commentators over a stretch of nine verses (9:35-10:5) with similar problems affecting the other discourses: (the Sermon on the Mount (placed variously at 4:23, 4:25, or 5:1), the Community discourse (variously at 17:22, 17:24, 18:1), and the Final discourse (variously at 23:1, 24:1, 24:3)).

[7] Keegan, "Formulae," 428-29.

[8] France, *Matthew,* 142-43. As the chart indicates, these features extend over a wide range of verses proximate to (or part of) each of the discourses and for this reason do not offer an unequivocal indication of the beginning of the discourses. For an attempt to tie Matthew's narrative to the discourses, cf. Smith, "Fivefold Structure," 544-51.

will become evident from an examination of the auditors for each of the discourses.

1. Who are the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount? Is the discourse directed at the crowds or the disciples? It is evident from 7:28 that the crowds heard the discourse,[9] yet less obvious that it was aimed at them in the first place. The lack of clarity stems from the fact that the participial introduction found here— ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους is itself ambiguous in Matthew.[10] At 9:36, it prompts Jesus' compassionate outburst, yet at 8:18 it serves as the motive for Jesus' withdrawal. Is Jesus' ascent of the mountain to be understood as an attempt to withdraw from the crowds, or an attempt to find an appropriate venue for teaching?[11] The latter is probably closer to the sense of 5:1.

Given this ambiguity, the question of the audience of the Sermon on the Mount has provoked an entire spectrum of views.[12] Some interpreters emphasize that the disciples are the intended recipients,[13] others, the crowds,[14] but most commentators rightly recognize that the discourse is directed at both. Trilling observes that "Jesus speaks to all his hearers of the true will of God, which they must all perform, but which the disciples have already begun to perform."[15]

2. Are the crowds also to be regarded as co-recipients of the Mission discourse? Keegan notes that the crowds "are placed on the scene at 9:36 and never removed".[16] Yet is this one feature sufficient to mark them out as recipients? Apart from their being mentioned at

---

[9] The crowds' reaction at 7:28 has been transposed from the synagogue setting in Mark (Mark 1:21-22) to "the mountain," and Mark's impersonal ἐξεπλήσσοντο has been applied to the crowds. See Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 333; DA I 724.

[10] So too, of course, is the αὐτοὺς at 5:2, which might well include the crowds.

[11] Cf. J. Schneider, "ἀναβαίνω" *TDNT* I 519; Werner Foerster, "ὄρος" *TDNT* V 485.

[12] This extends to the question of Matthew's sources. Strecker (*Die Bergpredigt: Ein exegetischer Kommentar* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984] 26,180) maintains that in Q both the crowds and the disciples were auditors (cf. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences," 147; Donaldson, *Mountain*, 110; Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 32-33). On the other hand, Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 333), Schweizer (*Matthew*, 78), and Dupont ("Le point de vue," 256#83) all hold that the disciples were the original recipients. Given the changes Matthew has made to 7:28, the latter alternative seems preferable.

[13] Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 45; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 99; among others.

[14] Schweizer, *Matthew*, 78-79.

[15] Trilling, *Matthew* I 61. For related views, see: Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 81; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 109; Jan Lambrecht, *Ich Aber Sage Euch: Die Bergpredigt als programatische Rede Jesu, Mt 5-7, Lk 6:20-49* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984) 28-29; Patte, *Matthew*, 62; Hans Windisch, *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951) 63-64.

[16] Keegan, "Formulae," 423, and more generally Barr, "Drama," 351.

9:36, Matthew gives no suggestion whatever that the crowds hear Jesus, or, for that matter, that they are intended to. Instead, as was argued above in Chapter Seven, there are strong indications that the discourse is directed solely at the disciples. Jesus is described first as speaking to his disciples (9:37), and then summoning his twelve disciples (10:1). After the discourse, he is described as having finished instructing his twelve disciples (11:1).[17] With audience markers as explicit and as unambiguous as these, it is more appropriate to suppose that the crowds were not included.

Why then are the crowds mentioned at 9:36? The most likely supposition is that they serve as the rationale for the mission and Jesus' discourse to his disciples. Once they have performed this function, they are relegated to the background. In this respect, Matthew's method of dealing with them is not much different from the soliloquy in a modern play. Even though there may be other actors onstage, they are understood not to hear because they have been subordinated to the action that is taking place in the foreground. And, generally speaking, Matthew's concern is almost exclusively with the foreground in his gospel.

3. The Parable discourse is the third assemblage of Jesus' words. As was noted above, it is the only one in which the crowds are singled out as the main recipient. It is also the discourse with the most intrusions of narrative. At 13:10-17 the disciples approach Jesus and ask him why he speaks to the crowds in parables. After the parables of the tares, mustard seed and leaven, Jesus leaves the crowds and goes into a house, where the disciples join him for the remainder of the discourse. The change of setting and audience is made very explicit. The crowds are expressly mentioned in the concluding passage at 13:34, which marks the end of the first part of the discourse (13:34 (cp. Mark 4:33 αὐτοῖς[18]), 13:36), and are again explicitly mentioned at 13:36, where Jesus is described as leaving them (τότε ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν).

If the second part of the discourse is evidently aimed at the disciples, what of the interlude at 13:10-17? Are the crowds privy to

[17] The λέγει at 9:37 is probably derived from Q (cf. Luke's ἔλεγεν 10:2 to the 70); cf. Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 44-45. Matthew's προσκαλεσάμενος 10:1 // Mark 6:7 προσκαλεῖται, // Luke 9:1 συγκαλεσάμενος. The conclusion at 11:1 is without parallel.

[18] J. Dupont ("Le Chapitre des Paraboles," *NRTh* 89 (1967) 816) remarks that "ici [sc. 13:34] du moins, *Mt* a pris soin d'ajouter le mot "foules," qui se ne trouvait pas dans le parallèle *Mc*."

Jesus' remarks about parables at 13:10-17 and the interpretation of the parable of the Sower (13:18-23) that follows? The προσελθόντες[19] at 13:10 implies that the disciples, in approaching Jesus, have distanced themselves from the crowds.[20] This impression is further strengthened by Matthew's use of pronouns—the αὐτοῖς of 13:10, and especially the ἐκείνοις of 13:11, when contrasted with the ὑμῖν or ὑμῶν (13:11; 13:16) used of the disciples, indicate that the crowds are far removed from the situation.[21] As the interpretation of the parable of the sower is also addressed to ὑμεῖς (13:18), it, too, is aimed solely at the disciples.[22] Thus, even in the part of the discourse directed at the crowds, there is a substantial portion that is evidently intended solely for the disciples.

4. The crowds are not mentioned near the outset of the Community discourse, and the discourse is set apart from the references to the crowds which precede and follow it (17:14; 19:2) by changes in setting (17:24 no //; 19:1 // Mark 10:1). It appears that the crowds are categorically excluded here.

5. If chapter 23 is to be regarded as part of the Final discourse,[23] then the crowds are recipients, since they and the disciples are addressed jointly at 23:1.[24] The crowds remain auditors until the end of the chapter. The situation alters at the beginning of the next chapter (24:1-2), where there is a change of scene, after which the disciples are described as coming to him privately (κατ' ἰδίαν // Mark

---

[19] Matthew appears to forget that Jesus was on a boat, even if one commentator has suggested that the disciples were on the boat with Jesus—cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 340. Gnilka (*Matthäusevangelium,* I 483) is probably right, however, in saying that "nicht die historische Situation diktiert die Feder...sondern der Inhalt von Frage und Antwort."

[20] Hans-Josef Klauck (*Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* [NTAbh 13; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978] 244) remarks "Doch markiert Matthäus 13,10 durch προσελθόντες eine Distanzierung der Jünger von der Volksmenge." Cf. Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 66; Gnilka, *Verstockung,* 90.

[21] Robertson (*Grammar,* 707) and Moulton (*Grammar* III 45) indicate that ἐκείνοις in this configuration is commonly used to refer to those who are absent.

[22] Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable* (Fortress, 1988) 66-67. Matthew's practice of bringing certain characters to the foreground suggests that they alone are being singled out for discussion (except, that is, when he introduces others later who are also said to have heard, such as the disciples at 13:10, who had not previously been mentioned).

[23] Barr ("Drama," 352) is not alone in regarding chapter 23 as part of the Final Discourse. See also Edgar Krentz, "Community and Character: Matthew's Vision of the Church" in *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 567; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 44; and Kari Syreeni, *Making,* 96.

[24] The disciples have been added; Mark only mentions the "great crowd" (Mark 12:37).

13:3) at 24:3. Once more, the crowds, as in Chapter 13, would only be present for part of the discourse.[25]

Having said this, chapter 23 should probably not be regarded as a constituent of the Final discourse. Those who do consider it to be such contend that the changes of audience and setting are not uncommon in Matthew's discourses, since the very same thing happens in chapter 13. Krentz has further argued that Matthew's omission of Mark's pericope of the widow's mite (Mark 12:41-44) indicates that Matthew has created a direct link between chapters 23 and 24. The resulting discourse could then be considered a commentary on the temple controversies and their implications for the disciples. This may be so, but it is based on a faulty comparison. While there is a change of setting and auditors at 13:36, the narrative intrusion into the discourse is brief. And apart from the narrative elements at 13:10, which are minimal, the only other intrusion of narrative into one of the discourses is at 18:21a—"Then Peter came up and said to him...,"—which is not so much a resumption of narrative as a mechanism for introducing the parable of the unforgiving servant. In all of these instances, the narrative has been kept to a minimum. At 24:1-3a, however, the narrative interlude is far more extensive. Nor is it simply a case of a change of setting and auditors, since there is also a change in subject matter. While there is a certain uniformity between chapters 23 and 24-25, one can adduce as much uniformity between chapter 23 and any of the four remaining discourses.[26] For these reasons, it is more probable that chapter 23 is not part of the Final discourse, and that the crowds are not auditors.

To sum up, of the five discourses, the crowds were likely among the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount, (part of) the Parable discourse, and chapter 23, which, however, should not be regarded as a part of the Final discourse.[27] The implications of these findings are considerable, and tend to fit with the findings made in the previous section. The first is that Jesus' teaching as represented by the discourses is imparted to the crowds in a very limited way. While they are considered recipients of Jesus' halachah in chapters 5-7 and

[25] Krentz, "Community," 567.

[26] These similarities are particularly marked between chapter 23 and the Sermon on the Mount. See the striking parallels between Matthew 6:1-18 and 23:1-22 noted by DA I 125-27.

[27] G. N. Stanton ("The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount" in Hawthorne and Betz, *Tradition,* 188) finds a "dual" audience (i.e., crowds and disciples) in the same discourses, though he appears to imply that chapter 23 *is* part of the Final discourse.

of Jesus' warnings about the Pharisees, they are notably absent from the other discourses. As they are the implicit object of the Mission discourse, it does not surprise that they are not included there. More notably, they are not auditors of the Community discourse.

C *The Portrait of the Crowds in Chapter 13*

There are four explicit mentions of the crowd(s) in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew: two at the beginning (13:2 ὄχλοι πολλοί ... πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος // Mark 4:1 ὄχλος πλεῖστος ... πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος) and two in the middle of the discourse, where the change in auditors takes place. Jesus' speaking in parables to the crowds (ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις 13:34) is regarded as a fulfilment of Psalm 78:2. After imparting this *Reflexionszitat*, Matthew indicates that Jesus then leaves the crowds and goes into a house (τότε ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν).

The four verses neatly encapsulate the portion of the discourse directed at the crowds. In addition to these explicit references, Kingsbury has argued that there are many more indirect references to the crowds between 13:2 and 13:36 in the form of the pronoun αὐτοῖς (13:3,10,13,24,31,33,34) or, on one occasion, ἐκείνοις (13:11).[28] Still, Kingsbury overstates his case in claiming that Matthew here "makes of αὐτοῖς a *terminus technicus* designating the Jews."[29] At 13:11 αὐτοῖς refers to the disciples, while at 13:31-34, as Sanders and Davies remark, the word is just as likely to refer to both the crowds and the disciples.[30] Certainly the disciples' demand for an explanation of the parable of the Tares (13:36) would tend to support such a view. What is important for determining the status of the crowds is how αὐτοῖς is used in relation to Jesus' disciples.

It has long been recognized that chapter 13 develops a major contrast between the crowds and the disciples.[31] Dupont and Klauck have observed that Matthew anticipates and prepares for this contrast in the pericope of Jesus' true family (12:46-50), which immediately precedes the Parable discourse.[32] It is here that the antithesis between the disciples and the crowds is first expressly developed, anticipating the distinctions to come. As was shown above, the Matthean crowds,

---

[28] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 13, 47. Cf. 13:3 // Mark 4:2 αὐτοῖς; 13:11 // Mark 4:11.
[29] Kingsbury, *Parables*, 47.
[30] Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 204.
[31] Dupont, "Le point de vue," 221.
[32] Cf. Dupont, "Le point de vue," 239-40; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 244#296. Of course, the distinction between the crowds and disciples is made as early as 5:1.

unlike the crowd in Mark's gospel, are not yet doing the Father's will. While this does not preclude their coming to do the will of the Father, it does demonstrate a notable deficiency on their part. Thus, at the very outset of the discourse, Matthew has introduced a major distinction between the two groups.

Matthew agrees with Mark in having Jesus direct parables at the crowd, even if Matthew's Jesus is described as speaking to them rather than teaching them (13:3 καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς, versus Mark 4:2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ κτλ).[33] Matthew's departure from Mark can be attributed to a more circumscribed view of teaching[34] or, possibly, to less optimistic expectations about the message's effect.[35] Alternately, it may simply stem from a certain disinclination to style the discourses as 'teaching.'[36] In any event, this 'speaking' is directed at them. This is not to say that the disciples are not tacitly included, as 13:10 makes evident, but here the crowds are the chief recipients (cf. 13:34).

Specifically, the crowds are the recipients of parables. Matthew emphasizes this fact by having the disciples ask Jesus directly why he speaks to the crowds in parables (13:10). This question is suggestive, because it might imply, as Jülicher argues, both that the disciples are familiar with the parabolic method of instruction, and that they find it a difficult one.[37] Yet the difficulty associated with the method is debated,[38] particularly over the question of the disciples' own

---

[33] Kingsbury (*Parables*, 28-30) interprets Matthew's substitution of λαλέω for διδάσκω as a sign of the "turning point" of Jesus away from the "Jews."

[34] For Matthew, διδάσκειν is related to the exposition of the law.

[35] Sanders and Davies (*Studying*, 209) remark that "'teaching' has the narrower connotation of enabling someone to learn, whereas 'speaking' may fall on deaf ears, and that is part of the situation to be described in the rest of the chapter." Their observation fits well with the use of λαλέω at 23:1, where Jesus' warnings about the Pharisees are directed at both the disciples and the crowds.

[36] Keegan ("Formulae," 420#26) observes that Matthew uses διδάσκω "at the beginning of the first discourse and never again at any point in any of the discourses." The same holds true for διδαχή, which is found at the end of the first discourse and not in any of the other discourses.

[37] A. Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [Freiburg: Mohr, 1899] II 32) accounts it "so eine schwere, vielverlangende Lehrweise." In Mark, "those who were about him with the twelve asked him concerning the parables" (Mark 4:10). Most of 13:10 is a reformulation of 13:3, though Matthew's customary προσέρχομαι is in evidence.

[38] See Bastiaan Van Elderen, "The Purpose of Parables according to Matthew 13:10-17" in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 189. He opines that "for Matthew, parables are not intended to conceal truth from the masses" but to clarify and illustrate.

capacity to understand it.[39] Is parabolic speech a propaedeutic designed to enable the hearer to penetrate the mysteries of the kingdom, or is it enigmatic speech intended to confound its auditor? What can be said for certain is that Matthew attaches considerable significance to the word παραβολή. Even though the word is not found in the gospel prior to chapter 13, it suddenly occurs eleven times within the compass of the chapter.[40] How then does Matthew understand the word?

D *Parables*

As is well known, παραβολή is derived from παραβάλλω meaning, "I throw beside or by," a sense that suggests its typical meanings in classical Greek of "comparison," "illustration" or "analogy."[41] Traditionally, however, παραβολή in the New Testament has been regarded as semantically more akin to the משל of the Hebrew Scriptures.[42] John Sider, however, has contested this insight, and argued that analogy is the decisive component of the synoptic parables. He claims that "From all the gospel applications of *parabolê* to particular sayings, it is clear that the center of the field of meaning is still just what it was for Aristotle—*illustration by analogy*."[43]

---

[39] In Kingsbury's view (*Parables*, 48-49), for instance, the disciples comprehend the parables as a matter of course, while for Dan O.Via ("Matthew on the Understandability of the Parables," *JBL* 84 (1965) 432) the disciples have understanding because "they have the special privilege of private explanations."

[40] Though this emphasis is more pronounced in Matthew, with 11 of the 16 instances of the word occurring in the chapter, it is also strongly evident in Mark with 7 of 12 instances of the word present in Mark's chapter 4.

[41] LSJ s.v. παραβολή. This is the sense in which Aristotle uses it in the *Rhetoric* (1393a-b), where it is defined (along with the fable) as being one of the two kinds of παραδείγματα. E. M. Cope, in his commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (*The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary*, rev. J. E. Sandys, [New York: Arno (1877) 1973] II 198), suggests that Aristotle "distinguishes parable *in general* from fable by this; that the former depicts *human* relations (in which the New Testament parable coincides with it); it *invents* analogous cases, which are not *historical*, but always such as *might* be so; always probable, and corresponding with what actually occurs in real life. The fable is *pure fiction,* and its essential characteristic is that it invests beasts, birds, plants, and even things inanimate with the attributes of humanity."

[42] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, II 33-42; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (Rev. Ed. London: SCM, 1972) 20; Donahue, *Gospel*, 5; Keener, *Matthew*, 371-5. For an indication of the semantic breadth of the term משל, see the overview in Madeline Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study* (CBQMS 6; Washington: C.B.A.A., 1977) 87-88.

[43] John W. Sider, "The Meaning of *Parabolê* in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists," *Bib* 62 (1981) 453-70. Curiously, Sider does not discuss (nor even refer to) Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. He suggests (470) that the usage of Matthew and Mark is confined to "analogy of equation describing an event."

While at first glance his appears to be a helpful approach, in practice it proves to be less so, partly because Sider has greatly expanded what is commonly meant by analogy (and indeed what Aristotle apparently meant by it) to the point of distortion. Sider's category of 'classification,' as he acknowledges, typically constitutes the first stage of defining something: "the tenor can be a particular instance, which is illuminated by appeal to the vehicle of a general category or principle... 'The heart is a muscle', or 'The heart is an organ.'"[44] Yet even when he is allowed such a broad understanding of analogy, he has trouble accounting for all the parables in the synoptic tradition, particularly the proverbial ones, such as Luke 4:23, "physician, heal yourself".[45] Given his rather Procrustean treatment, the traditional understanding of the term is to be preferred.

In Matthew, then, παραβολή generally refers to narratives.[46] All of the parables in chapter 13 fall into this category, as do the parables directed against the Pharisees—those of the Two Sons (21:28-32), the Wicked Husbandmen (21:33-44), and the Marriage Feast (22:1-14).[47] Apart from these instances, παραβολή also refers to the lesson of the Fig Tree (24:32 // Mark 13:28) and is used by the disciples of Jesus' utterance about what defiles a man (15:15 // Mark 7:17).[48]

Like Mark, Matthew does not appear to develop an entirely consistent understanding of parables and their interpretation.[49] On the one hand, he seems to suggest that parabolic interpretation is straightforward, since the chief priests and Pharisees are aware that he is speaking parables against them (ἔγνωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει) 21:45 cf. Mark 12:12). Given the blindness for which the Pharisees are frequently reproached (15:14; 23:16,17,19,24,26), their insight here is all the more noteworthy. In addition, Jesus summons the crowds to "Hear and understand" (15:10) about defilement coming

---

[44] Sider, "*Parabolê*," 461.

[45] He has similar problems with some examples in the LXX, as he himself recognizes ("*Parabolê*," 458).

[46] Though see Jones' (*Matthean Parables*, 89-90) provision of the additional categories of Descriptio, Narratio, and Allegoria. The following discussion will confine itself to Matthew's use of the word παραβολή, since it is the word itself that receives emphasis in chapter 13.

[47] Cf. 13:34,53; 21:33; 22:1. If 13:52 is a parable, then it is not a narrative parable.

[48] Matthew and Luke both omit Mk 3:23, presumably in favour of the Q version.

[49] Cf. Luz, *Matthäus 8-17,* 314; Overman, *Community*, 195-6. Kingsbury (*Parables*, 135) suggests that Matthew has incorporated a double tradition about the nature of parabolic speech into his gospel. While this may be true, Sanders and Davies (*Studying*, 210-11) observe that there are different degrees of understanding involved on the parts of the hearers.

from within. As the disciples go on to style Jesus' dictum as a "parable" (15:15), the entire passage appears to suggest that Jesus' "parable" should have been readily understood by both the disciples and crowds.

Nevertheless, there are frequent indications that parabolic speech is opaque.[50] One demonstrable instance of this is that interpretations are offered for the parables of the Tares (13:36-43), and the Dragnet (13:49-50) in the part of the discourse reserved for the disciples.[51] When this finding is joined with Jesus' earlier provision of an interpretation for the parable of the Sower for them, it suggests that parabolic speech requires interpretation. What is more, when it is recognized that the interpretation of the parable of the Sower is confined to the disciples, it emerges that all the interpretations are reserved exclusively for the disciples.[52] Nor is it particularly surprising that the two longest parables in the chapter—the Sower and the Tares—are interpreted for the disciples.

The point is all the more firmly brought out by the disciples' demands for interpretation. When the disciples and Jesus have left the crowds, they approach Jesus and ask him to explain the parable of the Tares (13:36). The word used by the disciples, διασαφέω ("make clear"),[53] is likely Matthean, since, apart from 18:31, it occurs only here in the New Testament. Similarly, when the disciples ask Jesus about "what proceeds from the man defiling the man," Matthew has the disciples phrase the question differently from the way they do in Mark. In the latter, they "asked him (ἐπηρώτων) about the parable" (Mark 7:17). In the first gospel, it becomes "Explain (φράσον)[54] the parable to us" (15:15). Certainly, the disciples are reproached for not understanding at this juncture, but presumably the rationale underlying the interpretations is their increased understanding. Such would appear to be the import of Matthew 13:52 as well—not that

---

[50] Cf. Hultgren, *Parables*, 462-3.

[51] Jeremias (*Parables*, 85, cf. 81-85) has effectively demonstrated that the interpretations are "the work of Matthew himself." It should also be borne in mind that Matthew follows Mark in having Jesus expound the parable (μάθετε τὴν παραβολή ν) of the fig tree to the disciples (24:32-36 // Mark 13:28-32).

[52] This is probably the reason for the awkward construction of the chapter, where the Tares parable is in the "crowds' "half of the discourse, and the interpretation in the "disciples'" half. The Tares parable has been placed in the first half of the discourse either because it is linked thematically with the Sower parable, or because it is designed to replace Mark's Seed growing secretly parable (Mark 4:26-29), which Matthew has omitted.

[53] BAGD s.v. διασαφέω.

[54] BAGD s.v. φράζω also suggests "interpret something mysterious". The Textus Receptus has φράζω at 13:36.

the disciples have always understood, but that they come to understand after Jesus' interpretations, and will, perhaps, come to a point where, ultimately, they no longer require interpretation.[55] Still, the dominant impression is that parabolic speech is obscure.[56] The disciples demand and are given interpretations to some of the parables. If, in fact, parables were to be regarded as straightforward illustrations, it is difficult to see why the disciples should require further interpretation, or why, for that matter, Matthew would place so much emphasis on the need for interpretation.[57]

E *Matthew 13:10-18*

Klauck observes with justice that "the contrast between the disciples and the people is decisive for an understanding of Matthew 13:10-18."[59] This contrast can be detected both in the form of the passage as well as its content. Formally, it can be seen in the use of contrasting pronouns. After the distinction between the crowds and the disciples is established at 13:10 it is accentuated by the emphatic ὑμῖν and ἐκείνοις of 13:11. These pronouns are then taken up by the parallel use of ὅστις in 13:12.[60] In the succeeding two verses, the crowds are twice referred to as αὐτοῖς and are, in turn, contrasted with the emphatic ὑμῶν and ὑμεῖς used of the disciples at 13:16 and 13:18. The overall effect is to differentiate the two sharply.

The same holds true for the manner in which the sentences are framed. At both 13:11 and 13:12, Matthew uses antithetic parallelism to highlight the differences between the two groups.[61] The effect of the twice-repeated δέδοται is to create a sharp disjunction between the two: "To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom

---

[55] Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 315.
[56] Lambrecht, *Treasure*, 158.
[57] This motif is integral to Matthew's recasting of Mark's obtuse disciples into disciples who understand. As the understanding of parables is one component of this recasting, it would surely be damning the disciples with faint praise to insist that they understood things that were perfectly straightforward. It is only when the parables are regarded as abstruse that this emphasis of Matthew's makes sense.
[59] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 244: "Der Gegensatz zwischen Jüngern und Volk ist bestimmend für das Verständnis von Mt 13,10-18"; cf. Burnett, *Testament*, 106; Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 93.
[60] Trilling, *Israel*, 77.
[61] Matthew has resituated 13:12 from its location at Mark 4:25 so that it follows immediately after Matthew 13:11 (// Mark 4:11) and echoes that verse's twice-repeated δέδοται.

of heaven, but to them it has not been given,"[62] an effect that is further intensified by 13:12.[63] A broader form of parallelism is elaborated over the next six verses, with three devoted to the crowds (13:13-15), and three to the disciples (13:16-18).[64] By means of frequently repeated keywords like "see," "hear," and "understand," Matthew makes the contrast even more pointed. The recurring causal ὅτι used of the crowds at 13:13 and twice of the disciples at 13:16 is particularly effective in this regard.[65] Taken together, the formal features of this passage demonstrate a carefully developed opposition between the two groups.

This contrast extends to the content of the passage. The most momentous distinction is the one made by Jesus at 13:11: "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given." The use of the divine passive here is worthy of remark, because it indicates at the very outset of the discussion that the distinction between the two groups is, ultimately, one that derives from God.[66] This distinction is made manifest through revelation.[67] The disciples are the recipients of the divine mysteries, while the crowds are not.

---

[62] Cf. Kretzer, *Herrschaft,* 98.

[63] Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 6. Part of this intensification resides in the fact that the parallelism in verse 12 is complete, whereas in verse 11, the second γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια is implied.

[64] The *Reflexionszitat* at 13:14-15 is often regarded as a later interpolation. In this regard, see Gnilka, *Verstockung,* 103-105; *idem, Matthäusevangelium,* I 477-78; Kingsbury, *Parables,* 38-39; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllingszitate,* 23-24; Stendahl, *School,* 130-32; Strecker, *Weg,* 70#3. Their view has not gone uncontested. Advocates of the passage's authenticity include Gundry, *Use*, 116-18; Hultgren, *Parables*, 462; Jones, *Matthean Parables*, 283#5; Trilling, *Israel,* 78#18; F. Van Segbroeck, "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Evangile selon Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents" in Didier, *L'Evangile*, 126-27 and *idem,* "Le scandale," 349-52. Although the passage's correspondence with Acts 28:26-27 is striking, so too is its virtually unanimous manuscript support. The uncharacteristic introduction of 13:14 is as at least as much in favour of the authenticity of the formula quotation as against it, since a later glossator would be far more likely to follow the pattern already established by Matthew. Most important of all, since the anomalies of the passage can otherwise be explained by reference to chapter 13 itself, it is preferable to assume that 13:14-15 is not an interpolation.

[65] Gnilka, *Verstockung,* 93.

[66] On the divine passive cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, 15; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 219; and Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 98, for the signification of the perfect.

[67] For a discussion of the themes of revelation and concealment and their correlation with 11:25-27, see C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 23-32. She regards the νηπίοις of 11:25 as a designation for the disciples (34), which means that 11:25-27 anticipates 13:10-17, and that both of these passages anticipate Peter's confession and Jesus' rejoinder at 16:16-20.

The nature of these μυστήρια is debated.[68] Hill is probably right, however, when he discovers in the secrets "the purpose of God concerning his kingdom—that it is inaugurated in the person, words and work of Jesus of Nazareth,"[69] though the eschatological aspects of the kingdom ought not to be ignored.[70] The disciples, therefore, have been imparted insights about the kingdom, particularly its advent in Jesus, that have been withheld from the crowds.

Verse 12 functions largely as a codicil to verse 11, as is made evident through the addition of γὰρ.[71] Klauck observes that this passage relates the activity of God to the disposition of the hearer.[72] It is possible that Matthew is applying this remark specifically to the disciples' predisposition to approach Jesus for further instruction—particularly interpretations of the parables.[73] In this case, the disciples would "have" in the sense that they are able to hear what Jesus relates to them (13:16,18), and to understand enough to know when to approach him for further instruction.[74] The crowds, by contrast,

---

[68] Kingsbury (*Parables*, 46) argues that they embrace the "whole of ethics and eschatology," while Gunther Bornkamm ("μυστήριον κτλ" *TDNT* IV 819) sees Jesus the Messiah as the mystery. Lambrecht (*Treasure*, 162) refers to "God's eschatological reign…in the person of Christ." Otto Betz (*Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* [WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr, 1960] 87) suggests that, in the NT, μυστήριον signifies "eine apokalyptische Weisheit, die mit der Prophetie verbunden und auf geschichtliche Vorgänge bezogen ist." None of these views is entirely satisfactory. *Pace* Kingsbury, it is better to say that the secrets serve as the grounding for ethical behaviour, but do not themselves comprise it. Bornkamm's view appears to be based solely on Mark, while that of Betz is overly influenced by the Qumran materials. Hare (*Matthew*, 150-1) is more percipient in discerning the mystery of divine calling as a part of these mysteries.

[69] Hill, *Matthew,* 226. Cp. R. E. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *MYSTERION*," *Bib* 39 (1958) 430.

[70] Lamar Cope (*Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* [CBQMS 5; Washington: C.B.A.A., 1976] 17), in arguing that "knowledge of the secrets is knowledge of impending judgement," underestimates the christological component of the kingdom.

[71] Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 102; Trilling, *Israel,* 77. For the well-known rabbinic parallel to this passage see Str-B I 661.

[72] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 248.

[73] Cf. 13:10; 13:36; 15:15. On προσέρχομαι see Thompson, *Divided*, 51-2 and James R. Edwards, "The Use of ΠΡΟΣΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL* 106 (1987) 67. Edwards notes that in about three-fourths of Matthew's fifty two uses of the word it is Jesus who is approached, and that it is the disciples who most frequently approach him to ask him questions. Edwards lists 8:25; 13:10, 36; 14:15; 15:12, 23; 17:19; 18:1, 21; 24:1, 3; 26:17.

[74] Via (*Self-Deception*, 117-21) follows a similar line, but fails to appreciate that the disciples' understanding is primarily of Jesus (cf. 11:27 with 11:25). As is made clear by 16:17-20, the disciples are indeed given by God more understanding of who Jesus is. This insight is followed by still more secrets about the kingdom, such as John the Baptist's identification with Elijah (17:13).

lack this basic predisposition, and the opacity of the parables exacerbates their situation.

Verse 13:13 continues the same line of thought, but is framed in such a way as to offer a direct response to the disciples' query at 13:10—"This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand". Matthew's substitution of ὅτι for Mark's ἵνα is sometimes thought to be a softening of Mark's portrayal.[75] Jesus no longer speaks to the crowds so that they will not understand, but because they are already without understanding. Yet this substitution does not soften the portrayal of the crowds; their obduracy is emphasized by Matthew's denying them any perception whatsoever. Unlike "those outside" in Mark, the crowds in Matthew do not see or hear at all.[76] Their unreceptive character is further emphasized through the inclusion of the citation from Isaiah 6:9-10, which gives a renewed emphasis to 13:13.[77] The use of the *hapax legomenon* ἀναπληροῦται indicates, as Gundry has suggested, that the quotation "now receives a full measure of fulfilment."[78]

By contrast, the macarism of 13:16 is intended as the antithesis to the Isaiah citation. The disciples' eyes and ears are pronounced blessed, precisely because (ὅτι) they see and hear. Unlike the crowds, they see and hear the long-awaited time of salvation in Jesus. Their insight is further developed by 13:17. The verse is clearly alluding to the messianic deeds of Jesus described at 11:5.[79] The disciples, in hearing and seeing the inbreaking of the messianic age,[80] are privileged to witness what many prophets and righteous men wanted to but could not. The macarism, therefore, implicitly condemns the crowds even further. If they were present, the prophets and righteous men, like the disciples, would have recognized Jesus and the dawn of the messianic age. Yet the crowds, who are present, conspicuously fail to perceive or understand what would have been so obvious and so welcome to their venerated forbears.

---

75 BDF 369(2); Carlston, *Triple*, 7.

76 Rudolf Schnackenburg ("Matthew's Gospel as a Test Case for Hermeneutical Reflections" in Bauer and Powell, *Treasures*, 257) describes it as "an intensification of the sense of the text." Cf. Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 93.

77 Trilling, *Israel*, 78.

78 Gundry, *Use*, 117; Van Segbroeck, "Le scandale," 349-52.

79 Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 484.

80 Klaus Berger (*Die Amen-Worte Jesu* [BZNW 39; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970] 86) points out that 13:17 reflects a Jewish tradition about the blessedness of those who live in the messianic age. Cf. PsSal 17:44; 18:6.

Taken as a whole, therefore, Matthew 13:10-17 is designed to create a sharp disjunction between the crowds and the disciples. Both in terms of form and content, the passage develops an unrelieved and explicit antithesis between the crowds and Jesus' disciples.

F *Matthew 13:18-23*

The antithesis between the crowds and disciples continues in Matthew's interpretation of the parable of the Sower.[81] It is most obvious in his inclusion of the word συνίημι, which occurs twice in the interpretation.[82] It is first mentioned at 13:19 in the explanation of the seeds sown on the path: "When anyone hears the word of the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what was sown in his heart." The second occurrence of the word is found in the interpretation of the seed sown on good soil: "this is he who hears the word and understands it; he indeed bears fruit." The recurrence of συνίημι (and ἀκούω) in such a context, just after 13:10-17, can hardly be fortuitous. Matthew has altered the parable's interpretation to make it correspond to the descriptions of the crowds and disciples he has elaborated in 13:10-17. In verses 13 and 14, it is twice related that the crowds hear but do not understand. Moreover, 13:12 states that what the crowds have will be taken away from them, a circumstance that corresponds to the point in the interpretation where the devil comes and snatches away what was sown in the heart. The crowds are equated with the seeds sown on the path.[83]

The correspondence also applies to the disciples. It is stated twice at 13:16-17 that the disciples hear,[84] while the conclusion of the Parable discourse (13:51) reaffirms the disciples' understanding of "all these things" (i.e., the parables of the kingdom 13:24,31,33,44,45,47 cp. 13:19 word of the kingdom). The correlation is obvious. They

[81] For a useful recent discussion of Matthew's parable of the Sower and its interpretation, see Hultgren, *Parables*, 180-202.
[82] The verb συνίημι is not found in Mark's or Luke's version. Given the word's prominence in Matthew (Matthew 9 Mark 5 Luke 4), its presence here is best taken as editorial. Cf. Hultgren, *Parables*, 195.
[83] Van Tilborg (*Jewish Leaders*, 43) would identify those sown on the path with the Jewish leaders. Yet given their association in the gospel with the term πονηρός (9:4; 12:34; 22:18; cf. 12:39,45; 16:4) it is more likely that the leaders are to be connected with the activity of ὁ πονηρός (contrast Mark's ὁ Σατανᾶς Mark 4:15).
[84] Cf. Jesus' emphatic introduction to the interpretation: ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείραντος (no //).

hear and understand, and—presumably—bear fruit.[85] The latter point, in any case, is borne out by the parallel Matthew has developed between 13:12 and 13:23. The disciples are made to abound at 13:12, just as the good seed produces fruit in abundance at 13:23.

This correlation becomes even more explicit when it is recognized that, in the interpretation, each of the auditors "hears" the word (13:19,20,22,23), but it is only the first and the last hearers who are described as either understanding or failing to understand. Such a state of affairs fits readily with the antithetical depiction of the crowds and disciples that emerges from 13:10-17. The disciples understand. The crowds do not. The interpretation of the parable relates explicitly, therefore, to the divine economy elaborated at 13:10-17.

If this correlation holds true, however, it casts the crowds in a poor light indeed. The interpretation indicates that, in Matthew's view, the crowds are like those sown on the path. They hear the word but do not understand it, and as a result, eventually lose it. Unlike the seed of the rocky soil and the thorns, the seed on the path does not even germinate. The crowds, like a hardened path, appear to be impervious to the message of the kingdom, and never respond at all. They are not even accounted among those who respond but fall away. One might have anticipated from the crowds' responses in the narrative sections of the gospel that they would figure among those who hear the word and immediately receive it with joy, only to fall away (13:20).[86] Apparently, however, from Matthew's retrospective point of view, at least, this portrayal would grant them too much understanding.[87]

G *Matthew 13 in the Context of Matthew's Narrative*

Taken as a whole, therefore, 13:10-23 presents a pessimistic view of the crowds. They are deliberately contrasted with the disciples in such a way as to make their deficiencies and obtuseness obvious. Such an understanding naturally poses serious problems for interpreting

[85] For Matthew, the disciples' hearing and understanding are largely presupposed. The gospel's continued stress on bearing fruit suggests that it is one of the evangelist's primary concerns.

[86] Though note Matthew's omission of Mark 12:37: "And the great throng heard him gladly."

[87] In my view, the parables that follow are not (*pace* Kingsbury, *Parables*, 63-91) explicitly concerned with the crowds. They are linked thematically by growth, and it is for this reason they follow the parable of the Sower. Cf. Hagner, "Matthew's Parables," 109.

the crowds. How is it that Matthew is so stridently negative toward the crowds at 13:10-23, and yet generally so well disposed toward them elsewhere in the gospel?

This problem is especially acute with regard to the position of chapter 13. Levine has remarked of chapter 13 that "it reads smoothly as a continuation of the previous narrative section."[88] Assuredly, it does not.[89] Prior to the pericope of the mother and brothers of Jesus (12:46-50), which, as was argued above, is organically related to chapter 13, the last action of the crowds was to ask if Jesus were the Son of David. Surely, after their insight into Jesus' true character (especially when contrasted with the Pharisees' malignity), it is decidedly odd that at this point in the gospel Jesus should reproach them for their want of understanding. The situation becomes all the more problematic at the Triumphal Entry when the crowds actually proclaim him as Son of David. Their understanding, if anything, actually increases over the course of the gospel. Hence, it is unexpected, to say the least, that Jesus should decry the crowds as being without understanding at this juncture—certainly the narrative fails to provide a concrete basis for Jesus' charge.

As was mentioned in an earlier chapter, Kingsbury's solution was to posit a "turning point," where Jesus rejected the crowds and turned instead to his disciples. Yet, his solution is inappropriate simply because it means discounting Jesus' ministry to the crowds after chapter 13. There is no doubt that Jesus' focus shifts toward his disciples, especially in chapters 16-20, but this shift is a far cry from saying he has turned away from the crowds.[90] After all, the two feeding narratives—with their messianic idylls—occur in the second half of the gospel, as does the special healing episode Matthew has created at 15:29-31. Jesus continues to teach the crowds up until his arrest. Nor, until the Passion Account, do the crowds turn away from Jesus. Like the disciples, they follow him to Jerusalem, and go on to proclaim him the Son of David. Even within Jerusalem itself, the presence of crowds discourages the chief priests and elders from

[88] Levine, *Salvation History*, 255. By the "previous narrative section," she means chapters 11 and 12. Lambrecht (*Treasure*, 155) tries to make the same point by associating the crowds with Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees at 12:34. It can be said, however, that Matthew 13:1-23 does follow smoothly as a continuation of 12:46-50.

[89] Luz (*Theology*, 2, 86-7; *Matthäus 8-17*, 311-12) remarks on this problem.

[90] This shift in emphasis is largely derived from Mark since, in the second half of the gospel, Matthew conforms to Mark's order far more closely than he does in the first half.

arresting Jesus. Hence, the narrative can scarcely be said to provide support for the "turning point" theory.[91]

The most effective solution to the problem is to recognize that the primary focus of the Parable discourse is not on the "historical" level of the gospel, but at the transparent level.[92] Klauck is surely correct when he argues:

> This estimation of the crowd may surprise at first, since Matthew otherwise adopts a series of positive statements about the crowds from Mark's editorial remarks. But in Matthew the level of the historical representation is transcended here. The opposition between the insightful disciples and the obtuse crowds points to the relationship between the church and the synagogues.[93]

There are several reasons for adopting this evaluation. The first, as Zumstein argues, is that the distinction between the disciples and crowds is so sharp that it requires a later situation in the life of the church (post 70 CE) to be explicable.[94] His view finds confirmation in the fact that the interpretation of the parable of the Sower presents an unequivocal judgement on the status of the crowds. The very fact that such a judgement could be ventured suggests a measure of distance on the part of Matthew and his community. The people of Israel have received the word, but have failed, thus far, to respond to it. This is to presuppose, however, that there is a transparent portrayal of the crowds. Whether such an assumption is actually warranted will be the focus of the next section.

H *Conclusion*

The discussion of the five discourses concluded that the crowds were among the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount, (part of) the Parable discourse, and chapter 23, though this chapter is not part of the Final discourse. That the crowds do not figure among the recipients of the Mission, Community or Final discourses provides

---

[91] This difficulty also reveals some of the limitations of straightforward narrative approaches to the gospel. No narrative rationale for Jesus' condemnation of the crowds in Matthew 13 is provided by the evangelist. It only makes sense when one recognizes that Matthew has used Mark 4 as his point of departure.

[92] Luz, *Theology*, 87; Schnackenburg, "Reflections," 257. It is because of its transparent characteristics that Chapter 13 is discussed at this point in the study. Whether this reading of the "transparent" crowds is warranted will be considered fully in the next section.

[93] Klauck, *Allegorie*, 249.

[94] Zumstein, *Condition*, 185#74.

still further confirmation that the crowds are not to be regarded as quasi-disciples of Jesus. This point emerges with particular clarity in the vivid distinctions made between the disciples and crowds in 12:46-13:52. It is not simply that interpretations to some parables are given to the disciples but not the crowds. Rather, the dichotomy between the two is accentuated in 13:10-17, a passage designed, both in terms of form and content, to distinguish the disciples from the crowds. While the disciples perceive and understand, the crowds are devoid of both these capabilities, a view, which is reiterated in Matthew's version of the interpretation of the parable of the Sower. Such a pessimistic portrayal of the crowds does not fit with the tenor of Matthew's narrative of the crowds, and is, therefore, best regarded as a passage more suited to the transparent level of the gospel.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

The Role of the Crowds: Their Situation In many respects, this portrayal of the crowds is the antithesis of the portrayal of the crowds in the previous section. There they understood something of Jesus; here they do not. There they acclaimed him; here they revile him. There they followed the Good Shepherd; here they follow the evil shepherds. Nevertheless, their fundamental identity has not changed. For Matthew, the crowds are still representative of Israel. He has simply drawn upon another characterization of the people of Israel already present in the Scriptures. Here he employs the topos of the people of Israel that characterizes them as deficient in understanding and hostile to the messengers sent by God. Where the narrative in the previous section showed them moving ever closer to a proper understanding of Jesus, this part of the narrative displays a profound move in the opposite direction—by the gospel's end they have joined with their leaders, even if a tacit distinction between the crowds and their leadership remains.

The Role of the Crowds: Their Unfavourable Portrayal Two features contribute to the unfavourable depiction of the crowds. The first is their complicity in Jesus' arrest and death. This negative characterization is, apart from chapter 13, first adumbrated in the crowds' formal declaration of Jesus as a prophet in the Triumphal Entry. Yet, where their declaration of Jesus as Son of David had commemorated the Messiah's advent, their declaration of Jesus as a prophet portends his violent departure. The crowds' rejection of Jesus becomes explicit in the Passion Narrative, where, under the sway of their leadership, they reject the prophet Jesus and call for his death.

The crowds' second unfavourable trait is their deficient understanding. Matthew's Jesus indicates that it has not been given to them to penetrate the mysteries of the Kingdom of heaven (13:10-23). Just as the prophets of old had not been fully understood by Israel, so now do the crowds fail to appreciate fully Jesus' words and his person.

The Function of the Crowds: Christology The unfavourable role of the crowds also serves to develop Matthew's Christology. The crowds' declaration of Jesus as prophet does not evoke the Eschatological

Prophet, but establishes Jesus as a true prophet and more. Their identification allows Matthew to situate Jesus (and John) among the prophets who had always been persecuted by Israel. Jesus' violent death vindicates him as a true prophet, and shows him to be the culmination of the prophets sent by God. Here Matthew's Christology perceptibly shades into his Salvation History.

The Function of the Crowds: Heilsgeschichte The crowds' rejection and condemnation of Jesus develop a salvation-historical emphasis in Matthew's narrative. The crowds' incomprehension is foreshadowed in the Parable discourse, and becomes explicit in the Passion Narrative. Jesus' citations of Scripture in his dealings with the crowds both at Chapter 13 and at his arrest reveal that he had anticipated both sets of circumstances. It further implies that their incomprehension and their rejection of Jesus were features of the comprehensive economy of God, an economy that resulted in the new people of God.

The Function of the Crowds: Apologetic Matthew's unfavourable representation demonstrates how the malign influence of the Jewish leaders, coupled with the crowds' own failure to understand, result in their complicity in his death, and the relinquishing of their status as God's chosen people. In sum, his apologetic explains how most of Israel came close to recognizing their messiah, and how and why they rejected him. Their rejection was something foreordained by God, and long predicted by Scripture. He further intimates that this rejection would precipitate the destruction of Jerusalem as the judgement of God for the wrongful death of Jesus. His heightening of the crowds' involvement in Jesus' death allows him to account for the severity of the judgement. At the same time, it is evident that Matthew's view is not unrelentingly harsh. The crowds are involved in Jesus' death, but largely as the pawns of their leadership. And, while they are condemned for their want of understanding, this deficiency appears almost venal next to the deliberate malignity of the Jewish leadership.

PART V

TRANSPARENT CROWDS

As was pointed out in Chapter One above, the crowds in Matthew have frequently been regarded as transparent for the situation in Matthew's own day. In addition, the last chapter assumes that the ὄχλοι in Matthew 13 are best regarded, not as historical, but as transparent crowds. The purpose of the present section is to test the legitimacy of these assumptions. Is it warranted to interpret the crowds transparently? If it is, for whom are the crowds transparent—Jews, Gentiles, or members of the church? The following examination will consider each one of these possibilities in turn. It will close with a consideration of the functions of the crowds within the gospel, particularly in relation to the transparent crowds.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWELVE

A *Historicized Groups in Matthew?*

The two preceding sections have analyzed the two antinomous portrayals of the crowds. Both the favourable and unfavourable features are deliberately emphasized by the evangelist. Paradoxically, the crowds' adulation of Jesus as the Son of David at the Triumphal Entry and their acceptance of responsibility for his death at 27:25 are both entirely characteristic features of Matthew's authorial activity. This paradox naturally raises the question why Matthew should have heightened both aspects of the crowds so markedly. Why does he introduce two topoi that present an inherently contradictory portrayal of the people of Israel (i.e., the crowds)?

One explanation is to interpret the crowds historically and dispense with any transparent interpretation.[1] On this reading, Matthew takes the crowds as an exemplar of the outworking of the Deuteronomistic ethic. Just as Moses presented the people of Israel with a choice between the way of life and the way of death, so too does Matthew depict the people of Israel choosing first the way of life and then the way of death. His gospel consistently and relentlessly blocks out the logic of the "two ways." The crowds, on one level, elucidate the perils of making the wrong choice. From a messianic idyll, where all their needs were cared for, the crowds end up in a position of helplessness, with eschatological woe soon to be visited on them. In the person of the crowds, therefore, Matthew presents every one of his readers with the same choice. The narrative of the crowds furnishes an historical object lesson.

To interpret the crowds thus would be to assume that Matthew's portrayal of the crowds is entirely a historicized one. This view, which is particularly associated with Georg Strecker, argues that the groups in the gospel ought not to be interpreted transparently, but as figures belonging to the unrepeatable past.[2] Strecker contends that both the

---

[1] I use the term "transparent" here, although other terminology is sometimes employed by scholars. Graham Stanton ("The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism," *BJRL* 66 (1984) 27) speaks of a "dual perspective," while J. Louis Martyn (*History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* [New York: Harper and Row, 1979] 29#22) in his examination of John differentiates between what he describes as the '*einmalig*' and 'contemporary' frames of reference.

[2] Georg Strecker, *Weg*, 193-94; *idem*, "The Concept of History in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 70-74.

leaders and the disciples belong to the "time of Jesus," an epoch characterized by the mission to Israel, and Israel's rejection of Jesus. The crowds, therefore, would belong to this epoch as well, although Strecker does not elaborate on their precise status, though he notes that they are depicted positively, at least until they, "together with the official representatives of Judaism, become responsible for Jesus' death."[3] Other scholars, however, have gone on to propose that the crowds too are historicized and belong to the unrepeatable past.[4] Garland, for one, finds that "Matthew is not reinterpreting "the crowds" from the vantage point of his own situation but is reflecting upon the history of the people of Israel."[5]

This view does have features to commend it. As the previous two sections have demonstrated, many of the features attributed to the crowds can be readily interpreted within the matrix of Jesus' ministry to Israel. Some characteristics, in fact, are particularly suited to a situation in Jesus' ministry. Do the crowds, then, require a transparent interpretation, or have they simply melded with their leaders, merging into an obdurate and misunderstanding Israel, an Israel that belongs to the "unrepeatable past"? Certainly by the gospel's end, the crowds appear to have thrown their lot in with that of their leaders. Are they then, part of the unrepeatable past, or are they—as the previous chapter proposed—construed as an ongoing entity in the Judaism of Matthew's day?

Obviously, much of the question hinges on Matthew's treatment of the other two groups in the gospel, the disciples and the Jewish leaders. If they are both historicized, then the crowds have probably been historicized as well. In Strecker's estimation both groups have been historicized and "ethicized" by Matthew. Both function thereby as exemplars to Matthew's church, either of appropriate ethical behaviour (on the part of the disciples), or of inappropriate ethical behaviour (on that of the Jewish leaders). As it was just suggested above that the crowds' experience could itself be taken as an example of Matthew's "two ways," it could cohere with Strecker's position. Just how germane, then, are Strecker's observations?

Without doubt, one or two features of Matthew's depiction of the Jewish leadership would favour Strecker's position. As was discussed in Chapter Two above, Matthew does not generally emphasize the

[3] Strecker, *Weg*, 106-7. He goes on (*Weg*, 116) to make the intriguing observation that the Gentiles assume the crowds' choric role after the crowds join with their leaders in condemning Jesus.

[4] Verseput, *Rejection*, 48.

[5] Garland, *Intention*, 38-39. Howell (*Matthew's Inclusive Story*, 250) would call into doubt "the equation of textual characters with extratextual persons."

distinctiveness of the groups that, for him, comprise the Jewish leadership—their designations are, in some cases, virtually interchangeable.[6] Matthew's use of the appellation "scribes and Pharisees" (5:20; 12:38; 15:1; 23:2,13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29) indiscriminately groups the two together, while the pairing "Pharisees and Sadducees" (3:7; 16:1,6,11,12(*bis*)) is even more problematic.[7] The collocation is often taken as a regrettable error on Matthew's part, reflecting his ignorance and, possibly, his gentile origin.[8] If nothing else, it could indicate that the individual distinctions that had pertained in the past had become so blurred for Matthew that they no longer had any real currency.

Such features lead Strecker to argue that the Jewish leaders do not reflect the contemporary community's situation in relation to Judaism, but, rather, have "the function of a topos, which represents the attitude of unbelief and thus also of iniquity, in contrast to the ethical demand."[9] Van Tilborg emerges with a similar assessment: Matthew "pictures the Jewish leaders as the antitype of the 'Christian,'" a negative construct that argues for "a fairly great and satisfactory distance on a historical level" from the Judaism of Matthew's day.[10] For Strecker and Van Tilborg, Matthew's portrait of the Jewish leaders is not designed to reflect contemporary Judaism, but is far more concerned with providing ethical directives for his community. It is no coincidence at all, therefore, that chapter 23, with its diatribe against the scribes and Pharisees, is actually addressed to the disciples and the crowds (23:1). The evangelist is warning his community, using the expedient of a negative example drawn from the past.[11]

---

[6] Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 12-22; Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 1-6; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 11-29. Garland's (*Intention*, 218-21) Appendix B offers a helpful chart comparing Matthew's designations of the leaders with those in Mark and Luke.

[7] Van Tilborg (*Leaders*, 2,4) suggests that both formulations are largely editorial. With respect to the latter, Jean Le Moyne (*Les Sadducéens* [Paris: Gabalda, 1972] 123) opines that "la formule 'Pharisiens et Sadducéens'...est un assemblage artificiel qui ne représente pas la réalité historique."

[8] See e.g., Meier, *Law*, 18-19.

[9] Strecker, "Concept," 75; cf. *idem*, *Weg*, 140-41. In what follows, "community" and "church" will be used synonymously. Whether the gospel is, in fact, directed at a specific community has been usefully queried by Richard Bauckham and others (Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998]). I assume here that Matthew's audience is both specific and general and that his understanding of the church is as well.

[10] Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 170,171. Garland (*Intention*, 45-46) also supports this position: "all the leaders of the Jews have been stereotyped as false, mostly under the rubric of the Pharisees."

[11] Garland, *Intention*, 214.

Are we to conclude, therefore, that the Jewish leaders in Matthew are largely an artificial literary construct with little reference to Matthew's own time situation? Several features speak against this assumption. For one thing, it is not quite true that Matthew's designations for the Jewish leaders are all interchangeable. Matthew shows a marked preference for depicting the Pharisees as Jesus' antagonists.[12] Despite this preference, he has largely preserved Mark's Passion Account, where responsibility for Jesus' death lies with the chief priests, scribes and elders, and not with the Pharisees.[13] It seems particularly odd that Matthew situates the references to the Pharisees only in Jesus' public ministry and not in the Passion Narrative, especially when he shows the Pharisees conspiring to arrest Jesus (21:46 no Markan //). If the references were to be taken as topoi, then what better place than the Passion Account to add them?

Nor can it be said that Matthew was oblivious to the distinctions between the scribes and Pharisees. Martin Hengel, in a pointed rejoinder to Strecker, explains the collocation as a reference to the emergent sages.[14] Further, Davies and Allison suggest that the reference to "the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (16:12) is "no more than a convenient phrase indicating shared error."[15] Indeed, one might say, on the basis of their interpretation, that this phrase embodies a tension that characterizes Matthew's approach. On the one hand, he is concerned with the historical account, which is presumably the rationale underlying his inclusion of the Sadducees (even if that account is artificial).[16] On the other hand, he brings in

---

[12] Cf. DA I 302; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 14; Luz, *Matthew 1-7,* 170; Trilling, *Israel*, 90-91; Verseput, *Rejection,* 51-52 and the *caveat* at #127. Note should be taken of the fact that Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 52-54) sees a tendency in the synoptic tradition to identify Jesus' opponents as scribes and Pharisees. Garland (*Intention*, 44#32) argues that the intensity of Matthew's anti-Pharisaic invective finds an analog in Luke. He overlooks the fact, however, that Jesus has nothing to do with the Pharisees in Matthew, while in Luke he is often invited to dine with them (cf. Tannehill, *Unity*, 170). Matthew's depiction of their intercourse is one of irreconcilable conflict.

[13] Cf. H.-F. Weiss, "φαρισαῖος," *TDNT* IX 37. In Matthew the Pharisees only reappear after the burial at 27:62.

[14] Martin Hengel, "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund," *TRu* 52 (1987) 374.

[15] DA II 32. They account for Matthew's omission of Mark's attributive clause about the Sadducees (οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, Mark 12:18 to λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, Matt 22:23) by suggesting on the basis of textual evidence that οἵ has dropped out by homoioteleuton.

[16] Hummel (*Auseinandersetzung*, 20) remarks that "Die Frage bleibt, warum Matthäus sich dann überhaupt für die Sadduzäer interessiert. Die einzig mögliche Antwort lautet, dass hier ein 'historisierendes' Interesse am Werk ist."

references to the emergent Pharisaic group, uniting them with the "old guard" of Jesus' day to demonstrate that the leaders (new and old) were united in their opposition to Jesus. Together they comprised what Trilling has styled as a 'Front,' united largely by their opposition to Jesus and his followers.[17]

Finally, would a mere topos justify the invective and abuse that Matthew directs at the Pharisees?[18] Chapter 23 begins with a reference to the disciples and the crowds, and has an undeniable didactic function, but can didacticism alone account for the animus levelled against the Pharisees? It seems unlikely. Hengel is surely correct to claim that "Matthew 23 would not have been written without an *acute* conflict with the Jewish leaders."[19] Matthew's community is undergoing or has just undergone an acrimonious divorce with segments of the Jewish community, and this state of affairs underlies his rancour.[20] For these reasons then, it seems more satisfactory to account for Matthew's preoccupation with the Pharisees by supposing that they represent a significant force in the Judaism of his own day.

As was indicated above, Strecker has also attempted to historicize the disciples. He maintains that through conscious "historicizing" Matthew emerges with different periods of salvation history: "the central epoch of history is the 'time of Jesus,' the time when Jesus is sent exclusively to the people of Israel….The disciples of Jesus are a part of the uniqueness of this epoch."[21] Because the disciples' era is part of the holy, unrepeatable past, the disciples are, in his view, best taken as idealized exemplars for the later community.[22] Two factors lead Strecker to such a conclusion. First, he argues that the evangelist conjoins the "disciples" (μαθηταί) with the "twelve" (δώδεκα) in order to equate the two.[23] Second, Matthew has further idealized the disciples by demonstrating that, unlike their counterparts in Mark, they understand Jesus, and perform the will of the Father.[24]

---

[17] Trilling, *Israel,* 91.

[18] Benno Przybylski, "The Setting of Matthean Anti-Judaism" in P. Richardson with D. Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity* (Vol. 1; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1986) 188-89.

[19] Hengel, "Bergpredigt," 375.

[20] Hare (*Persecution*, 96) is of the opinion that the "kind of anti-Pharisaism here evidenced is far too intense to be a matter of literary convention as in Luke. Some kind of unhappy contact with Pharisaism is required to explain the hostility of the author." See, too, Overman, *Formative*, 142-6; Vledder, *Conflict*, 125; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 51.

[21] Strecker, "Concept," 73; and *idem*, *Weg*, 191-206.

[22] Strecker, *Weg*, 193-94.

[23] Strecker, *Weg*, 191.

[24] Strecker, *Weg*, 193.

Ulrich Luz, however, has examined Strecker's contentions in detail, and convincingly established quite the opposite. Luz suggests that the association of the disciples with the twelve was already a *datum* in Matthew's time, and is in no way emphasized by him, merely presupposed.[25] Luz further demonstrates that there is no idealization of the disciples as such; Matthew has merely altered one feature of Mark's portrayal. Instead, Luz shows that the presence of the risen Lord mediates between the past and the present circumstances of the believer. The mediation of Jesus allows the experiences of Jesus' disciples to assume significance for the church. The latter partakes of his authority and engages in the activities he and the disciples performed. In sum, Luz effectively demonstrates that "the disciples are transparent for the present situation. Behind them stands Matthew's Community."[26]

Matthew's portrayal of the disciples and Jewish leaders, therefore, is not historicized. This being so, it is more than likely that the crowds are also intended to have a direct connection with Matthew's community, and are best viewed as being transparent. Yet, if the ὄχλοι represent the Jewish crowds at the "historical" level of the gospel, what of the "transparent" level? As was mentioned above in Chapter One, a number of studies treating the crowds confidently suppose that the crowds do figure at the transparent level, but disagree markedly over the identity of these transparent crowds.

B *The Transparent Crowds*

If the crowds are transparent, what is their identity and ultimate status? Opinions diverge broadly, not only concerning the ethnic constitution of the "transparent" crowds, but also their status in relation to Matthew's church. Do they finally become members of Matthew's community, or do they remain Jews separate from the community? The following examination will consider each of these options in turn, beginning with the question of the ethnicity of the crowds.

The Crowds as Gentile Converts The supposition that the crowds comprise predominantly gentile converts has been advanced by R. H. Gundry. He claims that the crowds "represent the masses in the church, professing disciples both true and false—the result of

[25] Luz, "Disciples," 99.

[26] Luz, "Disciples," 110, and cf. 99-110 for a detailed refutation of Strecker's position. See, more recently, C. E. Carlston, "Christology and Church in Matthew" in Van Segbroeck et al., *The Four Gospels*, 1294-5.

extensive evangelism among the Gentiles."[27] His advocacy of this position is doubtless linked to his supposition that the historical crowds were also composed of Gentiles. Gundry assumes that Jesus embarked on a ministry to the Gentiles after healing the daughter of the Canaanite woman, and that the feeding of the four thousand was a feeding of Gentiles.[28] If Gentiles figured among the crowds following Jesus, it is hardly unwarranted for Gundry to assume that they would also have followed Jesus after the resurrection. Presumably, he would regard the gospel's emphasis on the faith demonstrated by Gentiles (8:10; 15:28), and the Great Commission as a further warrant for his position.

The chief objection to Gundry's view is that the "historical" crowds are portrayed as being Jewish. As was demonstrated above in Chapter Four, the feeding of the four thousand was a feeding of Jews, not Gentiles. Jesus did not engage in a ministry to the Gentiles, and the crowds are regarded as Jewish throughout Jesus' ministry. What is more, the "historical" crowds reflect Jesus' particularism (cf. 9:36 with 10:6), and it would be a highly unexpected twist to have them represent Gentiles at the same time. Certainly, the gospel provides no grounds for such an identification. Finally, Gundry also assumes that the crowds are converts—whether this is a legitimate supposition will be considered next.

The Crowds as Jewish Converts Many scholars have argued that the Jewish crowds are transparent for part of Matthew's community. Gibbs, Legasse, Luz, and Minear, among others, have all interpreted the crowds as future church members.[29] Their chief justification is that the crowds follow Jesus; their following is regarded as emblematic of their present (and future) commitment.[30] Minear, drawing on the fact that "following" is used of both the crowds and the disciples, proposes that the disciples represent the clergy and the crowds the laity. Luz, by contrast, discerns no distinctive group of

---

[27] Gundry, *Matthew*, 65. Van Tilborg (*Jewish Leaders*, 160,161#1,171) also implies that they were gentile converts.

[28] Gundry, *Matthew*, 318. Cf. Blomberg, *Matthew*, 245-7; Carson, *Matthew*, 356-9; Jeremias, *Promise*, 35.

[29] S. Gibbs, "Torah," 45; S. Légasse, "Les miracles de Jésus selon Matthieu" in Leon Dufour (ed.), *Les Miracles de Jésus selon Le Nouveau Testament* (Parole de Dieu; Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1977) 246; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206; *idem*, *Theology*, 68; Minear, "Crowds," 39-42. See also Aerts, "Suivre," 506; Fenton, *St. Matthew*, 197; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 78; Twelftree, *Miracle Worker*, 108.

[30] Aerts, "Suivre," 506; Legasse, "Miracles," 245-46.

followers, nor a definitive structure of office.[31] For him, there is no salient difference between the disciples and the crowds. Yet even if the two scholars differ over the character of the Matthean community, both Luz and Minear would agree upon the ecclesial component of Matthew's portrayal: the evangelist's conception of "following" is conceived with the future church in mind. It addresses the post-Easter ramifications of discipleship.

In light of the discussion of ἀκολουθέω given above in Chapter Seven, however, this argument is undeniably problematic. There it was argued that the crowds' following of Jesus is not an indication of discipleship. Within the framework of the story of Jesus, the term is used of the crowds to help characterize them as the lost sheep of Israel. Their following of Jesus is an instinctive reaction marking the gathering of the flock and the arrival of the Shepherd King. Its orientation is salvation-historical and christological, not ecclesial.

It is just possible, however, that there is a limited transparency at work here, where individual features of the historical narrative and not the narrative in its entirety are transparent for the later community. The needy flock of Israel that follows Jesus becomes, as it does in the Gospel of John, the needy flock of the church that follows the disciples. Just as Jesus enjoins Peter to "tend (ποίμαινε) my sheep" (John 21:16), so the leaders of Matthew's community are told to care for the "little ones" as they would a lost sheep (cf. 18:10-14). Here then, the following of the needy laity could be said to correspond closely with that of the crowds.

Such a proposal is attractive, and certainly the transference of the sheep metaphor to Matthew's own community (10:16 cf. 18:10-14; 25:32-33; 26:31) may be an anticipation of the kind of developed application that the metaphor assumes in John.[32] What makes the proposal doubtful is that even Matthew's "little ones," in joining the community, would have assumed Jesus' yoke and set out to perform the will of the Father. This is not to deny the existence of *anomia* in Matthew's community, but presumably those joining the church, like Jesus' disciples, would have undertaken to do the Father's will (cf. 6:10), or at least have claimed to be doing so (7:21-22). Nothing of the sort, however, is ever suggested of the crowds. As 12:50 indicates, the crowds were not included among those who performed the will of the father.

---

[31] Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 201.

[32] See Menninger, *Israel*, 142-48. Menninger, however, puts too much weight on the evidence, and tries to make it conform to his theory of the remnant as the "New Israel."

Some scholars would adduce an additional reason for supposing that the crowds join the church: Matthew's feeding narratives appear to have a eucharistic component to them.[33] Since the crowds are the express recipients of the bread broken by Jesus and given to the disciples for distribution (14:19; 15:36), why should they not be accounted members of Matthew's church? Minear, for instance, argues, "To the degree that these stories were intended by Matthew to mirror later Eucharists to that same degree the *ochloi* represent the laity in those later gatherings."[34] Minear forbears to specify the extent of this reflection, but others have detected features in the feeding narratives that may mirror the Eucharist. According to Held, Matthew has edited Mark to limit references to fish in these accounts, and to draw attention to the bread.[35] Gundry further maintains that the omission of the division of the crowds into groups helps to portray them "as the whole, undivided church," suggesting their association with the later Christian community.[36]

Are these arguments sufficient of themselves? Other scholars would suggest that the eucharistic tendencies in Matthew's account have been overemphasized. Gnilka's examination of these narratives, for instance, leads him to conclude that the features of the feeding narratives do not allow for a eucharistic implication.[37] It is certainly the case that Jesus' blessing and breaking of the bread are in accordance with Jewish table customs,[38] as is Jesus' omission of the blessing over the fish in the feeding of the four thousand.[39] The Mishnah, for instance, relates that "This is the general rule: where there is a main food and aught that is but an accompaniment to it, the Benediction should be said over the main food and it need not be said over the accompaniment" (mBer. 6:7). Jesus' breaking of the

---

[33] Donaldson, *Mountain*, 260#27; Held, *Tradition*, 187; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 216; B. Van Iersel, "Die wunderbar Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition," *NovT* 7 (1964/5) 192-94. Note the parallels with 1 Cor 11:24.

[34] Minear, "Crowds," 31. Cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 291-2 and Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 162-63.

[35] Held, *Tradition*, 185-87.

[36] Gundry, *Matthew*, 294. Gundry also regards Matthew's addition of women and children as a reflection of families in the church based on the holy family in Matthew chapters 1-2 (p. 295).

[37] Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium* II 38. The above assessment is made of 15:32-39. Gnilka expresses a similar opinion concerning 14:13-21 (*Matthäusevangelium* II 9).

[38] Samuel Tobias Lachs (*A Rabbinic Commentary of the New Testament; The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, [Hoboken: Ktav, 1987] 241) observes that, in all three Synoptic Gospels, "Jesus here follows the rabbinic procedure at table." Lachs adduces mBer. 8:7; bBer. 35a, 46a; jBer. 8, 11a(41); bHull. 7b; bR.Sh. 29b in this regard.

[39] Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, II 9,38.

bread and his blessing have additional parallels in the description of an ordinary meal at Acts 27:35.[40] Further, Neirynck has argued that Matthew's purported eucharistic tendencies in relation to Mark have often been exaggerated.[41]

These arguments cannot quite expunge all of the eucharistic features from the feeding accounts.[42] Jesus' table practice may correspond with established custom, but the very fact that it is he who institutes the feeding can hardly help but produce (muted) echoes of the Last Supper. The most satisfactory way of accommodating these echoes is to recognize that the feeding narratives are doubly emblematic. On the transparent level, the narratives allude to the Eucharist in the community (certainly the fact that the disciples impart the bread to the people is telling) and, possibly, anticipate the eschatological banquet. On the historical level, they represent Jesus as the Shepherd gathering his flock, Israel. There may not be exact correspondence between the transparent and historical referents, simply because, at the historical level, the church did not yet exist. The crowds are conscripted in this instance, faut de mieux, to play future believers, although they as a group do not become such.

Additional confirmation that the crowds did not end up as community members is furnished by the crowds' exclusion from the majority of Jesus' discourses. The discourses are commonly construed to be reflective of the post-Easter situation of the church, and the crowds are absent from them all, except for the Sermon on the Mount and only half of the Parable discourse. They are not even proximate to the so-called Community discourse, where their absence is particularly conspicuous. That they are offered Jesus' halachah in the Sermon on the Mount, and issued a warning about the Pharisees in chapter 23 suggests that they are regarded as having the potential to join the community, but have not yet done so.

The same assumption can be adduced from the reference to the "Jews" at 28:15. It was suggested above in Chapter Ten on the basis of 27:64 that the crowds were the initial recipients of the lie that "has been spread among the Jews to this day." On this reading, the crowds would be included under the rubric Ἰουδαίοις, as members of the Jewish people. Of course, this reading depends on the assumption that "Jews" is an ethnic designation, an assumption that has failed to command universal assent. Some commentators, for instance, have

---

[40] Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 418.

[41] F. Neirynck, "La rédaction Matthéene et la structure du premier évangile," *ETL* 43 (1967) 51.

[42] See the balanced remarks of Luz, *Matthäus 8-17*, 441-2.

discerned a Johannine cast in the term, and understand it as an evaluative rather than as an ethnic designation. Gutbrod, for one, claims that it signifies those who refuse to trust in Jesus.[43] Yet, he goes too far in detecting a malign quality in the term. While the Gospel of John is unrelenting in its disparagement of "the Jews," the same can hardly be said about Matthew. First, it is not those "Jews" who believe the lie who are at fault, but those who deliberately promulgate it—i.e., the chief priests and elders. Second, Matthew's gospel provides little basis for imputing a pejorative connotation to the designation, since all the other occurrences of the word are used of Jesus by Gentiles, either by the Magi, or the Roman guards who mock Jesus.[44] In other words, Matthew understands Ἰουδαίοις as an ethnic designation for the Jewish people.[45] If, then, the historical crowds were the original recipients of the lie, then they are on a continuum with the Jewish people of Matthew's own day. They are not transparent for Jewish converts.

The Crowds as non-Christian Jews Given the logic of the above arguments, the most viable explanation is to suppose that the crowds are Jews who have not joined the church. This supposition makes the best sense of the data, since it imparts to the transparent crowds virtually the same role and status as the historical crowds.[46] It also

---

[43] Gutbrod "Ἰσραήλ," 376; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 877.

[44] 2:2; 27:11,29,37.

[45] J. D. G. Dunn ("The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period" in *idem* (ed.), *Jews and Christians*, 209) takes it in a generic sense as meaning "among Jews in general." While this interpretation is possible, he probably places too much emphasis on the anarthrous character of the word: "among Jews" as opposed to "among the Jews." Names of peoples, however, are generally definite in sense even when they are anarthrous. Cf. Moulton, *Grammar*, III 169 as well as Matt 10:5 and Plutarch's query (*Moralia* 671 C) "Who the God of the Jews is." (Τίς ὁ παρ' Ἰουδαίοις θεός). Sim's (*Christian Judaism*, 149-50) supposition that "Jews" includes Matthew's community is implausible since it overlooks the fact that "Jews" is an exoteric term. If the community were included at 28:15, Matthew would have said "among 'Israel' to this day."

[46] This identification raises the question of whether the transparent crowds might be identified with the 'am ha-aretz (עםהארע). While possible, it is more likely that they are not. David Hill ("On the Use and Meaning of Hosea VI. 6 in Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 24 (1978) 110-13) has argued convincingly that Matthew identifies "sinners" (9:10) with the 'am ha-aretz. If the 'am ha-aretz are historical, it is best to suppose that, for the post-Easter situation, the "common people" comprise a part of the crowds, but the crowds are by no means synonymous with them. As in the historical narrative, the crowds would be more broadly conceived. This is also the view of Aharon Oppenheimer (*The 'Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic Roman Period* [ALGHJ 8; Leiden: Brill, 1977] 227-28) of the gospel crowds in general. Yet as noted above, Haas ("Literary Character," 139-53) furnishes good reasons for supposing the designation 'am ha-aretz to be literary rather than historical.

coheres well with Matthew's approach toward the Jewish leaders and disciples, where, *mutatis mutandis,* the groups do not qualitatively change. So, too, with the crowds. They remain poised midway between two groups, except that now the two groups are the church and emergent Pharisaism.[47]

Some commentators have questioned the legitimacy of making such a pat identification. Stanton, for instance, argues that any "'one to one' correspondence between the crowds and the Jewish community of Matthew's day is too simplistic."[48] His objection, however, overlooks the fact that Matthew has already produced a simplistic "one-to-one" correlation in his association of the "historical" crowds with the "lost sheep of Israel" of the Hebrew Scriptures. Stanton, by overestimating the gentile component to the crowds, does not recognize that Matthew has already identified the crowds with the people of Israel,[49] and if he has already employed this sort of typology once, why should he not do so again?[50]

How then do the transparent crowds figure in the gospel? Not unexpectedly, perhaps, they are seemingly most in evidence in the gospel as recipients of the church's ministry, particularly its healing ministry. In the Gospel of Matthew, healing is confined to Israel; the great commission does not include healing in its mandate. The community apparently undertakes its therapeutic ministry as one both established and empowered by Jesus Immanuel. Several features in Matthew would support such an inference, most notably, the open-ended character of the mission to Israel. While in the other two Synoptic Gospels the disciples return and tell Jesus what they have done (Mark 6:30-31; Luke 9:10, cf. 10:17), it does not happen in Matthew. The mission to Israel is construed as an ongoing one.[51]

---

[47] In the past few decades it has become conventional to regard Matthew's gospel as the product of a single community, written for that specific community. Graham Stanton ("The Communities of Matthew," *Int* 46 (1992) 371-91" and "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," 9-23) has rightly questioned the legitimacy of this assumption. I would follow him in his suggestion that Matthew's gospel is "a 'foundation document' for a cluster of Christian communities" ("Revisiting," p. 17).

[48] Stanton, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," 14. His remarks are a direct response to Anthony Saldarini (*Christian-Jewish Community*, 38), who states that "it is likely that the author of Matthew meant the crowds to symbolize the Jewish community of his day, which he hoped to attract to his brand of Judaism." Cf. Kupp (*Emmanuel*, 68#53), who adopts a mediating position.

[49] Stanton, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," 15.

[50] Matthew's typological explanation would also explain why and how he is able to overlook the various first century "Judaisms" in his schema.

[51] DA II 190; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 403; Sim, *Christian Judaism*, 158.

The same inference can be drawn from the changes Matthew has made to the Q pericope at 11:2-4. As Schweizer has noted, Matthew gives Jesus' reply to John's disciples in the present tense. Unlike Luke, who gives the reply in the aorist—ἃ εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε (Luke 7:22), Matthew has the present tense—ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε (11:4).[52] The differences in tense and verbal aspect may suggest that preaching and healing are ongoing in the post-Easter church. The community continues to exercise the ἐξουσία imparted to them by Jesus in their dealings with Israel.

Some of the pericopae involving the historical crowds are also suggestive of post-Easter controversies. Obviously, it is methodologically problematic to take the same narrative to speak to the historical and transparent levels of a gospel. It may be that there is no straightforward correspondence, or, indeed, no correspondence whatever. Sanders and Davies rightly argue that without "independent evidence about each community, it is hazardous to infer the social context from the text alone."[53] Since, however, no such evidence exists, our only option is to work from the text alone, while recognizing full well the speculative and tentative character of such a proceeding.

With this caveat, there are two pericopae that point to the therapeutic activity of Matthew's church amongst transparent crowds: the cognate exorcisms of 9:32-34 and 12:22-24. The fact that Matthew has emphaiszed the passage by transforming the Q episode into a doublet is itself suggestive. Several features in the two narratives indicate a post-Easter purview. The explicit introduction of the Pharisees as Jesus' antagonists is noteworthy; they are not mentioned by either Mark or Luke (Mark 3:22 has "the scribes from Jerusalem," while Luke 11:15 has "some of them"). In Matthew, the Pharisees have become the chief disputants with Jesus, and, as argued above, figure as "transparent symbols of the rabbis and synagogue leaders of Matthew's day."[54] Their *Streitgespräche* with Jesus may additionally mirror ongoing controversies between the church and Jewish authorities, and, in particular, christological controversies.

[52] Schweizer, *Gemeinde,* 21. Christoph Burger ("Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9," *ZTK* 70 (1973) 287) sees in the miracle chapters themselves (8:1-9:34) an outline of the activity of the church: "Matthäus bietet nicht einfach eine Sammlung von Wundertaten Jesu. Mit Hilfe überlieferter Taten und Worte Jesu umreisst er das Wunder der Kirche Christi."

[53] Sanders and Davies, *Studying,* 221.

[54] DA II 139. In the discussion that follows, it will be assumed that the "Pharisees" represent the rabbis and synagogue leaders of Matthew's day, and the crowds the "transparent" crowds.

Strikingly, it is the crowds' identification of Jesus as the Son of David that elicits the Pharisees' opprobrium.[55]

That some such situation is in view in the above two passages can be inferred from Matthew 10:25—"If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more will they malign those of his household."[56] Apart from this verse, the only other times where Beelzebul is referred to in the gospel is in the above two passages ("prince of demons" 9:34, "Beelzebul" 12:24, cf. 12:27).[57] If the disciples are being maligned like Jesus, the clear implication is that they are being maligned for undertaking the same sorts of activities, namely, exorcisms or healings.[58]

It is arguable, therefore, that the two passages reflect post-Easter controversies, as well as an ongoing therapeutic ministry to Israel. Hummel recognizes that this account "gives the impression that miracles played an important role in the conflict between Matthew and Judaism over whether Jesus was the Messiah."[59] The two passages could indicate that the therapeutic activity of the church was being used to legitimate its claims about Jesus, with the exercise of its ἐξουσία provoking two sorts of reaction—antipathy from the "Pharisees" and "scribes," and astonishment from the crowds.

References to the church's ἐξουσια can be detected in other passages as well. As indicated above, most commentators are agreed that the crowds' praise: "they glorified God, who had given such authority to men" (9:8) applies to the situation of the post-Easter community. Unlike the scribes, with whom they are contrasted (9:3-4), the crowds apparently recognize that the church's claims to heal and pronounce forgiveness originate with God. Davies and Allison remark that we "are probably to see in Matthew's conclusion an assertion of the right of Christian authorities to pronounce absolution. The practice is legitimated—against the protest of the spiritual descendants of the scribes?—by appeal to the words and deeds of Jesus, who wished his disciples to do what he did (cf. 10:1)."[60]

---

[55] Cf. Luz, *Theology*, 68; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 53.

[56] The verse is probably Matthean; cf. Gundry, *Matthew,* 195. Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 90) holds that it is either Matthean or an independent saying he has incorporated. Its future orientation makes a context in the later community highly probable.

[57] Strictly speaking, neither of these passages call Jesus Beelzebul; but accuse him of performing the exorcisms "by (ἐν τῷ) Beelzebul."

[58] Luz, "Disciples," 108; Eduard Schweizer, "Matthew's Church" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 132.

[59] Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 123.

[60] DA II 96. Cf. Vledder, *Conflict*, 203.

That the transparent crowds appear receptive to the church's message may also help to explain the vehemence of the Jewish leaders' opposition. It is certainly noteworthy that three of the four therapeutic miracles in which the leaders appear contain favorable reactions on the part of the crowds.[61] In general, the responses of the crowds and Jewish leaders are grouped together, and the reactions of the "scribes" and "Pharisees" are calculated to discredit the miracles, presumably, in order to maintain their own influence over the crowds.[62] Yet, their antipathy could have had a more pronounced justification.

Matthew's gospel may reflect a time in the church where Jesus, because of his healing activity, had been branded a γόης and a deceiver by elements among Jewish authorities. Matthew is alone among the Synoptic Gospels in having the Pharisees appear briefly after the Passion Narrative,[63] and on the one occasion where they do appear, they join with chief priests in condemning Jesus as ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος, and adjudge his messianic claims a πλάνη (27:64).[64] Nor is the accusation that Jesus is in collusion with Beelzebul far removed from the charge that he is a deceiver and a magician.[65]

A similar charge is to be found in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*. He relates that Jesus "healed those who from birth were blind and deaf and lame. He cured them by His word, causing them to walk, to hear, and to see. By restoring the dead to life, He compelled the men of that day to recognize Him. Yet though they witnessed these miraculous deeds with their own eyes, they attributed them to magical art; indeed, and they dared to call him a magician who

---

[61] On only one occasion do the crowds respond to Jesus' healing activity when the Jewish leaders are absent (15:31). The one miracle where the crowds do not figure is the healing on the sabbath 12:9-14 // Mark 3:1-6 // Luke 6:6-11.

[62] E. P. Sanders (*Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* [London: SCM, 1990] 240) contends that the historical Pharisees "seem to have had a very appreciable public following and to have been admired and respected." Oppenheimer (*The 'Am Ha-Aretz*, 159-60) similarly argues for cordial relations between the Pharisees and the *'am ha-aretz,* but he only adduces one text, which does not, of itself, support the weight he places on it.

[63] Brown, *Death* II 1431. There is also one reference to the Pharisees at John 18:3.

[64] Cf. John 7:12, where some members of the crowds say of Jesus: "he is leading the people (πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον) astray." Matthew's gospel also eliminates those features of Mark, which might make Jesus look like a magician. His very care to eliminate these features might suggest that he had reasons, apart from his Christology for doing so. See further, Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 53.

[65] Morton Smith's (*Jesus the Magician*, 31-33) views on this question are suggestive, if overstated.

misled the people."[66] That Justin was not misrepresenting these accusations may be inferred from a related charge in the Babylonian Talmud: "He who sins and causes the multitude to sin is not afforded the means of repentance." In the uncensored edition of the Talmud, this sentence is immediately followed by: "a master has said, 'Jesus the Nazarene practised magic and led Israel astray'" (bSan 107b).

It is possible then that Matthew's community, once invested with Jesus' authority, would have, on the principle of 10:25, incurred the same opprobrium. The church's apparent thaumaturgic ability could help to explain the unrelieved opposition of the "Pharisees" to the church just described above. If the "Pharisees" were convinced that Jesus was a magician, and that the church was performing demonic healings in his name, their antipathy would be understandable. Such a state of affairs would explain their concern that the people not come under the church's influence, and also suggest why the "Pharisees" are described as being present with the crowds when the church performs its healings.[67] They intervene to prevent the multitudes from being led astray and deceived by the church's seductive therapeutic practices.[68]

Of course, such a reconstruction is highly speculative. Given the examples listed above, however, it can be inferred with some certainty that the transparent crowds were the object of the church's ministry and that this ministry was an ongoing one. With somewhat less confidence, it can be suggested that a therapeutic ministry was the occasion of conflict among the community and Jewish functionaries.

Intriguingly, a similar scenario is afforded by the early chapters of Acts. Peter and John are described as going up to the Temple where they heal a man lame from birth. All the Jewish people react with wonder and amazement (Acts 3:10), and in the face of their astonishment Peter preaches to them, attributing the man's perfect health to faith in Jesus. Peter and John are then arrested by the priests, the Captain of the Temple, and the Sadducees, who were annoyed "because they were teaching the people and proclaiming in

---

[66] *Dial* 69 in *The Fathers of the Church. Writings of Saint Justin Martyr* (Tr. Thomas B. Falls; New York: Christian Heritage, 1948).

[67] According to Lachs (*Rabbinic*, 178), in Jewish literature, Jesus' "disciples and those who followed them are best known through their healing activity in the name of Jesus."

[68] Matthew's community may have experienced some form of opposition. Certainly, the gospel's references to persecution are numerous enough to suppose something of the sort (10:17-25; 23:34), though they hardly allow for certitude. See, further, the cautious remarks by Hare "Jewish," 266.

Jesus the resurrection of the dead" (Acts 4:2). In Luke-Acts, the therapeutic ministry of the disciples produces converts and followers. The pattern is repeated several times, most explicitly at Acts 5:12-18. As Achtemeier has noted, "Luke appears to have a more unambiguous reliance on the possibility that miracles, and thus miracle stories, can serve as the basis for faith in Jesus."[69] For Luke, therapeutic miracles serve as the platform for the *kerygma* of the community.[70]

Does the same pattern apply to Matthew? While the evangelist may suggest that the church's ministry provokes a positive response, there is no indication of any further commitment on the part of the transparent crowds. Whether the fault lay with the church's "little faith" as 17:17 might suggest, with the persecution of the church by Jewish officials, or some other cause is difficult to say. Given the presumption of the church's continuing ministry, Matthew provides several indications that the Jewish people were still not won over.

C *Matthew's Dual Economy*

The parable of the Vineyard is often regarded as one such indication, since it furnishes an encapsulation of Matthean salvation-history.[71] The kingdom is to be taken away from the tenants of the vineyard and "given to a nation producing the fruits of it" (21:43). The nation has often been interpreted as the church, and the tenants as Israel.[72] On this reading, the crowds and their leaders lose the kingdom to the Christian church.

Several scholars, however, have recently called attention to the often-overlooked fact that Jesus' remarks at 21:43 are addressed only to the chief priests and Pharisees.[73] Levine remarks that here, "Matthew distinguishes between leaders and sheep."[74] It is not all of

---

[69] Paul J. Achtemeier, "The Lukan Perpective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch" in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978) 165. He is speaking of Luke's gospel, but also includes Acts within the discussion.

[70] This is well brought out by R. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation*, Vol. II (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 48-79.

[71] For advocates of this position, see the list in Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 243#57.

[72] As in Strecker, *Weg*, 33. Cf. Blomberg, *Matthew*, 325; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 219.

[73] Keener, *Matthew*, 510-11; A.-J. Levine, *Salvation History*, 209; Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 60.

[74] A.-J. Levine, "Anti-Judaism," 31. Saldarini (*Christian-Jewish Community*, 61) also draws attention to the condemnation of the "elders and princes" of the people found at Isaiah 3:13-15.

Israel that is rejected, but its leadership. This observation is certainly correct, although the import of the finding is variously interpreted. Wilson, for instance, contends that it matters little—"the use of *ethnos* broadens the scope to include Israel as a whole, of whom the leaders are representative."[75] Saldarini and Sim, however, would both take issue with such an assumption. They claim that 21:43 is not about the transference of the kingdom at all, but merely about the transference of leadership.[76] In their estimation, the passage simply condemns the Jewish leadership, and no transfer of the kingdom to a new people is in view. Sim categorically states that the "pericope in no way suggests that the evangelist's community had broken with Judaism; rather, it details God's rejection of the Jewish leadership, and it demonstrates that Matthew's Christian Jewish group claimed (albeit unsuccessfully) a leadership role within the Jewish community and within the Jewish religion."[77]

Saldarini would go even further: not only does Jesus confine his parable to the leadership, but also the word "nation" (ἔθνος) at 21:43 is without theological import. Saldarini claims that the ἔθνος mentioned at 21:43 does not refer to a new people or to a "*tertium genus*."[78] Rather, in his view, Matthew's own ἔθνος is "a small subgroup, whose exact makeup is not specified."[79] This ἔθνος should not be translated "nation" at 21:43, because Christians were emphatically not a nation. He avers that even if Matthew were referring to "all the Christian communities in the Roman Empire…this *ethnos* would not match the definition of a nation or even that of a coherent ethnic group."[80] Nevertheless, in his view, this subgroup will replace the corrupt leadership of the Jewish people and guide the lost sheep of the House of Israel correctly.

It must be said that Saldarini's argument is unsatisfactory, and not simply because of his conjunction of sociological terminology with biblical language. His redefinition of ἔθνος as a subgroup or "voluntary society" at 21:43 runs counter to the use of the word, not

---

[75] Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 55.

[76] Overman (*Community*, 303) balks at the prospect of Matthew conceiving of "*a Judaism*." (his italics). Yet, the fragmentation of first-century Judaism has probably been overemphasized.

[77] Sim, *Christian Judaism*, 149.

[78] The phrase "*tertium genus*" is from Stanton, *New People*, 11-12; cf. Schenk, *Sprache*, 217; Strecker, *Weg*, 33.

[79] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 60. Saldarini is followed by Overman, *Community*, 303-4; Sim, *Christian Judaism*, 148-9. Harrington (*Matthew*, 304) opts for "group of people."

[80] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 60.

simply in Matthew, but in the entire NT, where the word almost always signifies a "nation" or "people."[81] Saldarini rightly observes that that in the Hellenistic period the word ἔθνος has other specialized meanings apart from "people" and "nation," but he is quite unable, apart from the verse in question, to adduce a single instance where Matthew employs one of these specialized meanings.[82] Nor is Saldarini's reluctance to classify Christians as an ἔθνος warranted. 1 Peter, which may be roughly contemporaneous with Matthew's gospel or slightly later, is able to address its readers with the following paraphrase of Exodus 19:6: "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people" (ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν 1 Peter 2:9).[83] If the author of this epistle appears to have no reservations about describing Christians as a distinct nation and people, it should hardly be problematic for Matthew to do so. Jesus' statement at 21:43, therefore, is best understood as marking the transference of the Kingdom of God from the Jewish leadership to a new nation.

This still leaves the question of the parable's recipients. Can the Jewish leaders be understood, as Wilson suggests, *pars pro toto*, as representative of all Israel? The reservations of Sim and Saldarini would carry some weight were it not for the fact that Matthew *does*, in fact, furnish an additional economy that concerns the crowds: Matthew 13:10-23 functions as a comparable pronouncement. Matthew's gospel contains not one but two accounts of God's divine economy, which symbolically encompass all Israel: one for the crowds (13:10-23), and one for their leaders (21:33-43).

These two accounts have extensive points of overlap in their respective "economies." A detailed comparison reveals very substantial similarities, not only in vocabulary, but also in conception.

13:11-13	21:43
διὰ τοῦτο (v.13)	διὰ τοῦτο
ὑμῖν (v.11)	ὑμῖν
ἀρθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ (v.12)	ἀρθήσεται ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν
τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν (v.11)	ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
δοθήσεται (v.12)	δοθήσεται
καρποφορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν (13:23)	ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς[84]

---

[81] K. L. Schmidt, "ἔθνος" *TDNT* III 369.
[82] It is telling that the specialized meanings Saldarini adduces are not even to be found in BAGD.
[83] On the possibility that 1 Peter presupposes Matthew, see Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 93.
[84] Note that Matthew has added ποιέω at 13:23.

As the chart demonstrates, there is a marked resemblance between the language at 13:12-13 and 21:43. Particularly noteworthy are the future passive verbs: δοθήσεται and ἀρθήσεται both occur in 21.43 as well: ὅτι ἀρθήσεται ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία...καὶ δοθήσεται.[85] Here it is God who will both give and take away. While the ὑμῖν of the two passages refers to a different group in each instance, both passages describe the same process.

In each case, Jesus furnishes a pronouncement on the group in question (διὰ τοῦτο). When he does, he uses the divine passive in the future tense to elucidate the purposes and activity of God. In addition, the purposes of God are also disclosed through having Jesus cite scripture (21:42=Ps 118:22-3; 13:13-15=Is 6:9-10). While both citations already occur in Mark, Matthew differs from Mark in using the citations to anchor Jesus' salvation-historical pronouncements.

Further, the kingdom figures prominently in both passages. In the case of the parable of the Vineyard, the kingdom itself is taken away from the chief priests and Pharisees, and given to a new people. In chapter 13, the capacity to know the mysteries of the kingdom is taken away—the ability for the crowds to comprehend the significance of Jesus' life and ministry. In the former, the kingdom is something that has already been ceded to the leaders. The vineyard had been granted them as the representatives of the chosen people. The judgement of God consists in removing this privilege from them and entrusting it to more worthy recipients. In the case of the crowds, however, the kingdom is something that they do not yet possess. They do not comprehend. Here the judgement of God consists in withholding this knowledge because of the crowds' lack of receptivity. Hence, there is a manifest difference in the character of judgement of the two groups. The leaders are condemned for their wickedness and unrepentant disobedience to God and his messengers.[86] The crowds, by contrast, are guilty of obtuseness—a lack of openness to God and his purposes.

Additional similarities in the two economies emerge in the fruit theme common to both. The Jewish leaders are unwilling to produce fruit for God, and they deliberately withhold the fruits from God and his messengers. With the crowds, it is a different matter. If, as was argued above, the crowds are associated with the seed that was sown on the path, they do not produce fruit simply because of their lack of

[85] Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 102.

[86] Cf. 23:33: "how are you to escape being sentenced to hell?" and 15:13 "Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted."

receptivity. Here, it is not a natural malignance that is in question, but an incapacity; they do not produce fruit because they are unreceptive to the "word of the kingdom." Obviously, this response is culpable—Jesus employs parabolic speech precisely *because* (ὅτι, 13:13) of the crowds' incapacity. Yet, just as obviously, the crowds' response is not so culpable as that of their leaders. The crowds differ from the disciples in only one essential: they lack understanding. By contrast, the chief priests and Pharisees are represented as knowingly and selfishly resisting God and his purposes, and are condemned accordingly. Matthew, therefore, *pace* Sim, condemns the Jewish leadership *and* the crowds. All of Israel is condemned—though for different reasons—and the kingdom passes from Israel to the new people of God.

Yet, if the crowds have not joined the church, does this fact mean that they have been categorically rejected and excluded from membership in the kingdom as the new people of God? No, it does not. What is most remarkable about this two-fold schema is that the crowds are not grouped—even in their incapacity—with their leaders. Matthew's situation of the passage in chapter 13 is telling. The evangelist has Jesus prophesy the crowds' future at this point, while the Jewish leaders are decisively condemned later, after Jesus has entered Jerusalem.[87] In other words, Matthew has not written the crowds out of the prospect of salvation. Their present lack of understanding is something that can be amended in the future.

In this regard, Matthew's position has suggestive points of comparison with Paul's own appraisal of his people in Romans 9-11. At Romans 11:7-8, for instance, Paul writes: "Israel failed to obtain what it was seeking. The elect obtained it, but the rest were hardened, as it is written, 'God gave them a sluggish spirit, eyes that would not see and ears that would not hear, down to this very day.'" Paul also recognizes the fact of divine hardening, and acknowledges that the people of Israel "to this very day" (cf. 28:15) have failed to respond to the good news. Yet, he indicates that this state of affairs originates with God, and will change once God's purposes are accomplished: "I want you to understand this mystery: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel will be saved" (Rom 11:25-6).

---

[87] Heil (Carter and Heil, *Matthew's Parables*, 71) misses the significance of this point. He asserts that in Matthew 13 the crowds "epitomize the continued failure of repentance on the part of both the crowds and the Jewish leaders." Yet, Heil provides no warrant for importing the Jewish leadership into a discourse where they do even appear.

While Matthew may not envision quite the same scheme of salvation, he still evidently anticipates the intervention of God. After all, as Matthew's use of the divine passive makes evident, God himself has hardened the people of Israel.[88] Further, Matthew's use of the perfect tense indicates that the crowds' state continues to the present moment. While Matthew is not so explicit as Paul is in projecting the future salvation of the people of Israel, he, nonetheless, appears to expect the repentance of the people of Israel.[89]

This surmise is substantiated by Matthew's provision of a dual dispensation. That he has deliberately distinguished the crowds from their leaders argues that there must be some point underlying the distinction. He has not presented the two groups as one monolithic—if variegated—entity[90] and then condemned them as a single *massa perditionis* for the simple reason that he envisages two separate outcomes. Two dispensations arguably imply two sets of expectations. Where he clearly regards the Jewish leadership as having been expelled from the kingdom, he does not do so for the crowds. The opportunity still remains for them to understand the mysteries of the Kingdom of heaven.[91]

Nor can it be said that Matthew has lowered his expectations to such a degree that he merely hopes that individual Jews will be converted. Ironically, Matthew's extreme pessimism about the seed sown on the path in the interpretation of the parable of the Sower—i.e., the crowds—implies that this is the case. Matthew's interpretation has the crowds not responding at all. On this reading, none of the Jewish people became Christian converts. Yet, surely such a judgement is unduly negative—Matthew's community must have featured Jewish converts. The evangelist appears, then, to be indulging in all-or-nothing thinking: the people as a whole have not responded. Even if there have been some Jewish converts, it is not the harvest that he has anticipated and—implicitly—continues to expect. Donaldson has justly, therefore, described the crowds as a group

[88] Jones, *Matthean Parables*, 285.

[89] Dale Allison ("Matt 23.39=Lk 13.35b as a Conditional Prophecy," *JSNT* 18 (1983) 75-84) argues that 23:39 indicates that salvation is contingent upon acceptance of Jesus. Cf. further, Stanton (*New People*, 248-51), who discerns in Matthew a threefold paradigm of sin-exile (punishment)-return used to explain the behaviour of the people of Israel.

[90] As earlier studies of the gospel contend—cf. Strecker, *Weg*, 33; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 145.

[91] While the overall analysis of Jones (*Matthean Parables*, 285) differs from the above interpretation, he rightly observes that "Mt 13:10-15 refers to the possibility of repentance and healing, even for those who are as yet blind."

"whose eschatological status… remains open to the end,"[92] and his assessment is correct, not only for the "historical" level but the "transparent" one as well. For Matthew, the transparent crowds remain poised between the Jewish leadership and Matthew's Christian community.

If it is sometimes remarked that the Gospel of John reflects a "divorce" between the Johannine community and the formative Judaism of his day, much the same could be said of Matthew.[93] To develop this somewhat crude metaphor further, one could add that Matthew's community is likewise divorced, except that there is a custody battle involved—each group is attempting to gain custody of the "crowds," with each regarding itself as the "legitimate" parent.[94] This scenario would help to explain the difficulty Matthean scholars have had in determining whether Matthew and his community were *intra-* or *extra-muros*.[95] If the church has consciously dissociated itself from formative Judaism and become a new people, it is, nevertheless, addressing itself to the larger Jewish populace in the expectation of winning them over.[96] Matthew's community is still engaged in its ministry to the people of Israel in the hopes that they may yet understand. The transparent crowds are still, as it were, *en jeu*.[97]

At the same time, this protracted lack of success has given impetus to a very different ministry among the Gentiles.[98] It would seem safe to say—*pace* Sim—that Matthew was doing more than simply authorizing a gentile mission in principle for other constituents of the whole Christian church.[99] Rather, the generally favourable representation of the Gentiles throughout the gospel provides sufficient reason to suppose that such a mission had been embarked

---

[92] Donaldson, *Mountain*, 207. Cf. Vledder, *Conflict*, 232.

[93] John T. Townshend, "The Gospel of John and the Jews: The Story of a Religious Divorce" in Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 72-97.

[94] Accordingly, language that speaks of Matthew's community in relation to a "parent group" is misleading as a clue to Matthew's own perspective (cf. e.g., Overman, *Formative*, 142); Matthew conceives of his own community as a "parent group."

[95] See the discussion in Senior, "Between Two Worlds," 2-5.

[96] It is this feature of the gospel that argues most forcibly against a "remnant" theory of the church, such as that advocated by Menninger (*Israel*). Matthew still expects that the majority of the Jewish people will convert, since, in his view, the church is the future of God's covenant people. And, while Matthew's community or communities may have sectarian features, its sensibility is decidedly non-sectarian. See Riches, *Matthew*, 78.

[97] Cf. John Meier ("Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102) and Overman (*Community*, 152) against Douglas R. A. Hare and Daniel Harrington ("Make Disciples of All the Gentiles (Mt 28:19)," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 359-69).

[98] Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 233-34.

[99] As proposed by Sim, "Gentiles," 42-44.

upon by the evangelist and his church.[100] The condemnation of Jesus by "all the people" at 27:25 marks the shift to the mission to "all nations," the Jewish people included. Now the privileges once the preserve of the chosen people, are extended to the Gentiles as well.

The consequence of these two ministries is that Matthew's community is itself in a sort of limbo—not yet completely dissociated from its Jewish milieu, nor yet fully committed to a non-Jewish sphere of influence.[101] Matthew has categorically rejected the emergent rabbinate, but this judgement does not hold for the Jewish population as a whole. The evangelist and his community still hope for their conversion, but are, nevertheless, ready to continue to attribute failure to divine hardening should this conversion continue to be delayed.

To sum up, the dual economy that Matthew describes helps to clarify Matthew's relation to Judaism. Recent examinations have urged that Matthew and his community are still situated within the confines of Judaism, because 21:43 condemns only the Jewish leadership. Matthew 13:10-23's provision of a divine economy for the Jewish people in addition to one for their leaders suggests that this is not the case. The kingdom has shifted to a new people, a people also engaged in a mission to the Gentiles. Nevertheless, Matthew's prevailing focus remains the Jewish people, and he continues to await their conversion.

D *The Function of Matthew's Narrative of the Crowds*

If Matthew is still anticipating their conversion, it is reasonable to assume that the gospel itself would play some part in this process. As Moule remarked nearly forty years ago, the Gospel of Matthew "is very clearly aimed *at* Jews."[102] The gospel has indicated that the

---

[100] While Sim ("Gentiles," 19-48; *idem*, *Christian Judaism*, 216-31) offers a corrective to those who overpraise the place of the Gentiles in Matthew, he ends up by considerably overstating the case. For a balanced response, see Senior, "Between Two Worlds," 5-23.

[101] Donald Senior uses the attractive phrase "between two worlds" ("Between Two Worlds," 1-23).

[102] C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (London: A. & C. Black, 1962) 88, italics his). He further remarks that Matthew's gospel "seems designed as an apologia, to be used by Christians in reply to curious or critical Jews" (p. 73). Note the earlier view of Theodor Zahn (*Introduction to the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909) Vol. II 562), who contends that it is "extremely probable that Matthew desired to see his book read primarily by Jews who were not yet Christians." See, also, Dunn, *Partings*, 155; Saldarini, *Christian-Jewish Community*, 43; *idem*, "Jewish-Christian Conflict," 54.

people are deficient in understanding, and this understanding, of course, is the very information that the gospel provides. In presenting its overall portrayal of Jesus and his ministry, the gospel displays a dual focus in its orientation toward the Jewish people, corresponding to the favourable and unfavourable topoi it provides. The first is an address and invitation to the lost sheep of the people of Israel. The second is an apologia and condemnation of the obdurate people of Israel for following a dubious leadership.

While it remains obscure how Matthew would expect the great mass of Judaism to read or hear his gospel, he could surely count on it being mediated by his Christian readers/hearers.[103] In an ongoing mission to Israel, this situation is precisely what one would expect. The gospel message would be promulgated, not only in the meetings of the *ekklesia*, but also by the envoys sent out.[104] Obviously, the complete narrative of the crowds in the gospel would be less suitable for this form of exposition, but individual segments of the gospel lend themselves to such a context, particularly those segments where Jesus addresses the crowds. Here the narrative crowds function transparently for the Jewish people of Matthew's day; Jesus' words of invitation and reproof can be taken to apply to them directly.

The invitation Jesus directs "to all" at 11:28 is a case in point. Chapter Seven established that the adjuration to assume Jesus' yoke was directed at the crowds as a remedy to the "heavy burdens" imposed by the halachic pronouncements of the scribes and Pharisees. Deutsch remarks that the invitation "reflects a context of competition for disciples between the teachers of Matthew's community and those of the opposition."[105] In contrast to their unfeeling leaders, Matthew's Jesus is able to supply his people with the eschatological rest and blessings of the messianic age.

On the other hand, the Jewish people of Matthew's day are implicitly reproved for their deficient understanding and their allegiance to a discredited leadership. Here, too, the audience markers of the discourses furnish a suggestive *introit* into their

---

[103] Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* (Chapter 10) indicates that in the second century at least some Jews took the trouble to read the gospels. Justin further indicates (*Trypho* 38.1; 112.4) that Jewish teachers tried to prevent Jews from discussing Jesus with Christians. His *Apology* (67.3) reveals that the "memoirs" of the evangelists were read in worship services. It is also noteworthy that Celsus, the anti-Christian polemicist, invents a fictional Jew to confute Jesus and the details of his life (Origen, *Cels*. Praef. 6; 1.28).

[104] Cf. 10:17; 23:34.

[105] Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom*, 118. Whether Deutsch would identify the crowds with the "disciples of the Pharisees" is not entirely clear.

situation. As was shown above in Chapter Eleven, the crowds are recipients of part of the Parable discourse, and the anti-Pharisaic diatribe. They are also auditors of the Sermon on the Mount.

The first part of the Parable discourse confronts them with Jesus' prophetic explanation for their obduracy.[106] The Paul of Acts (Acts 28:25-6) employs this very same tack when he concludes his address to the Jewish leadership at Rome with the assertion: 'The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet "Go to this people, and say...."' His direct and extensive citation of Is 6:10 serves as a provocative challenge to his audience by asking them to interpret the import of the prophecy. Justin Martyr employs the same gambit in his address to Trypho and his fellow Jews—he cites Isaiah 6:10 (*Trypho* 12.2), and adds: "but you [Jews] still won't listen. The Lawgiver has come, and you do not see him." Matthew's discourse raises the same issue and the same challenge. The people's behaviour thus far has fulfilled prophecy—will they continue to fulfil it unwittingly or ultimately plumb the mysteries of the kingdom?

A similar challenge is presented by the inclusion of the crowds as auditors of the warnings against the scribes and Pharisees. As was argued above, the Anti-Pharisaic discourse is not historicized, but reflects circumstances that were highly topical for Matthew. Saldarini relates that "chap. 23 with its seven woes, its mocking of Jewish practices, and its exaggerated accusations against the Jewish authorities, is an attempt to delegitimate them in the eyes of the whole Jewish community."[107] In their stead, Matthew attempts to legitimate his own leadership, and his own halachah.

Both these concerns are also a notable feature of the Sermon on the Mount, which condemns the praxis of the scribes and Pharisees, and posits Matthean alternatives.[108] Betz maintains that the Sermon on the Mount "played an important role in attracting people to the Church,"[109] and the slightly derisive reference to "their scribes" at 7:29 provides a suggestion of just how attractive this halachah was seen to be.

These passages suggest, therefore, that Matthew addresses the Jewish people directly through the "crowd" discourses. It is also likely

---

[106] At the historical level, the crowds are not privy to 13:10-23.
[107] Anthony J. Saldarini, "Delegitimation of Leaders in Matthew 23," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 667. Compare Justin's frequent warnings against Trypho's ("Pharisaic" cf. 137.2) "teachers" in the *Dialogue*: 9.1; 38.2; 43.5; 48.2; 62.2; 68.7; 71.1; 110.1; 112.4-5; 117.4; 129.5; 134.1; 137.2; 140.2; 142.2.
[108] Cf. 5:20; and possibly, 6:2,5,16.
[109] Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 81.

that he addresses them obliquely by means of the topoi he has sketched out. Matthew uses the example of the people from Jesus' time to promote and evoke a similar response from his own generation. Here too he offers invitation and reproof, corresponding to his two representations of the historical crowds.

The note of invitation can be discerned in the privileged place Matthew accords to the "lost sheep" of Israel, through his emphasis on the exclusiveness of Jesus' ministry to them. Matthew stresses thereby the historical crowds' role as heritors to the promises made to Israel. The focus of Jesus' entire ministry was the people of Israel. Second, Matthew repeatedly demonstrates that Jesus lavished the benefits of the messianic age upon his people. The particular focus on Jesus' healings reveals that he was the awaited Davidid, who through his ministry ushered in the promise of messianic blessings. These blessings continue to be mediated through the therapeutic ministry of the church, should the people choose to participate in them.

The historical crowds' response to Jesus' ministry furnishes a further example. Just as the narrative of the disciples in the gospel provides a model for future disciples,[110] so also Matthew uses the crowds in their favourable incarnation as a model for approaching Jesus. The crowds of Jesus' day accepted his ministrations. He did not seek them out; they sought him. He did not command them to follow him, they chose to do so themselves, and did so throughout his public ministry. Despite their leaders' negative influence, they were able to penetrate his identity and publicly acclaim him as the Son of David to all Jerusalem. If they were suborned at the end, Matthew indicates that not even Jesus' disciples stood firm. Matthew proffers, therefore, an invitation to the Jewish people of his own day to follow the insights of their forbears through to their natural conclusions and acknowledge Jesus not simply as Son of David, but also as Lord. They need only reject their current perverse leadership and assume Jesus' easy yoke to do so.

The alternative emerges in Matthew's unfavourable depiction of the crowds, which is unabashedly condemnatory. Most decisive is the charge that the people truckled to their leadership, having failed to heed Jesus' warnings, and became responsible for Jesus' death, precipitating the fall of Jerusalem. The crowds are used then as a negative example, and Matthew urges the people of his day not to

[110] Cf. Donaldson, "Making Disciples," 41: "Within the story of Jesus, the disciples function primarily as a model of what is involved in being a member of Jesus' 'people.'"

make the same mistake—not to follow an errant and blind leadership when they could follow the Son of David instead.

Thus, Matthew makes use of his favourable and unfavourable representations of the historical crowds to address the contemporary people of Israel. Because of this dual focus, he is able to dispense both invitation and condemnation. Matthew, like one of the prophets of old, offers both blessings and curses to the people of Israel. Just as Moses had once offered Israel the way of life and death, so too does Matthew. This rhetorical strategy is itself an inducement, since this pattern would have been suggestively familiar to those well acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures. Matthew's mode as well as his message is prophetic.

In addition to the above functions, the account of the crowds provides an apologia and justification for the situation of Matthew's church, aimed both at outsiders and church members. The gospel validates the transfer of the kingdom from the Jewish people and their leaders to a new people. Matthew stresses how God had remained faithful to his promises to Israel. Jesus came, as the prophets before him had done, exclusively to Israel. It was not God or his son who revoked the covenant. Rather, the leaders of Israel, in leading the people astray, and in killing Jesus, revoked the covenant. Their rejection was something foreordained by God, and long predicted by Scripture.

Both the favourable and unfavourable representations of the crowds are explicitly linked to this fulfilment of prophecy. While the fulfilment citations themselves often demonstrate how Jesus was the expected saviour of Israel in specific instances, his involvement with the crowds constitutes the broad fulfilment of his prophetic ministry. The promises made to Israel about the Son of David visiting and caring for his people find their realization in the entirety of Jesus' ministry to Israel, just as Jesus' ministry as shepherd is the outworking of the citations of Micah and 2 Samuel (Matt 2:6). Similarly, the crowds' failure to comprehend, their arrest of Jesus and involvement in his Passion are also fulfilments of Scripture. In short, all of Jesus' dealings with crowds, from the inception of his ministry to his arrest, themselves fulfil what was written in the prophets. As Matthew has Jesus say to the crowds: τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν (26:56).

Matthew is thus able to use the Scriptures to sanction his own community's status as the new people of God, and legitimate their position as the heir to God's promises and prophecies in the Hebrew Scriptures. The crowds validate Matthew's interpretation of salvation-history. Matthew's concern, therefore, with Israel's past

(including the narrative of the crowds) discloses a need to sanction the status of his own community.[111] The self-identity of his church is still bound up with its relation to Israel, even if its focus is, increasingly, the gentile world. As Riches observes, Matthew's community "sees itself as living out the fulfilment of all that has been promised of old. Just at the moment of the sharpest sense of rupture with the past Matthew vigorously asserts his community's continuity with the past."[112]

The beauty of Matthew's conception is that the dual representations of the crowds legitimate the status of Matthew's community, whether the Jewish people join the church or not. By drawing upon the topoi established by the Hebrew Scriptures, Matthew can explain the crowds' induration as the time-honoured reaction of the people of Israel to God's initiative and to his prophets. If the people do repent of their obduracy and acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God, then they are simply returning to a right relationship with God, just as they had done so many times before. Either way, Matthew is able to situate their actions within the framework of God's plan. The people of Israel are seen to conform to Matthew's interpretation whether they wish to or not.

In conclusion, Matthew uses his two representations of the crowds to address the Jewish people of his own day, both directly and obliquely. By means of the twin goads of invitation and reproof, he hopes to woo them away from their discreditable leadership and have them join the church. At the same time, he uses the dual representations of the crowds to sanction his interpretation of *Heilsgeschichte*. To these two functions, one can clearly append others: the crowds serve as a tool to vilify the leadership of formative Judaism;[113] they furnish a negative exumplum for the edification of Matthew's community, as well as a template for missionary activity.[114] Yet given the twin issues of the identity of the people—Jewish; and their status—transparent, it is likely that the above-mentioned functions predominate. The crowds highlight Matthew's relationship to Judaism.

---

[111] Senior, "Between Two Worlds," 3.

[112] Riches, *Matthew*, 106.

[113] One would expect, however, that the crowds are primarily the reason for the vilification, and not the means.

[114] For Carter ("Crowds," 65) the crowds function as a "model for the audience's mission task."

E *Matthew's* Sitz-im-Leben

The above analysis raises questions about Matthew's historical relation to Judaism. Does the reconstruction just proposed mesh with the historical context of the gospel? While undeniably speculative, there are some suggestive points of overlap. The time frame commonly suggested for the gospel is the period after the fall of Jerusalem,[115] perhaps as late as the 80s C.E.[116] That Matthew is addressing a situation after the destruction of Jerusalem readily coheres with some of the distinctive features of his dual portrayal of the crowds.

Such a situation, for instance, fits extremely well with the need expressed by the crowds. As the second section demonstrated, the crowds are characterized by their overwhelming want: they require healing, teaching, feeding and guidance. That healing should come to the fore so prominently in the gospel is somewhat surprising. While the need of the crowds is undeniably signalled by passages such as Ezekiel 34, and christological concerns, one cannot but help but feel that there are, perhaps, other factors at work. The neatest explanation is that Matthew is addressing the ravaged people of Israel, who have just experienced the horrific consequences of a punitive Roman conquest.

Josephus has provided us with vivid descriptions of the trauma visited upon Jerusalem (*BJ* 7.1-4,38-40, 112-15; *Vita* 417-21). Especially evocative is his account of the images on the moving stages displayed in Vespasian's triumph in Rome:

> Here was to be seen a prosperous country devastated, there whole battalions of the enemy slaughtered; here a party in flight, there others led into captivity; walls of surpassing compass demolished by engines,

[115] It is surprising, given this date, and Matthew's apparent Jewishness, that the impact of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is not stressed more often as a feature profoundly influencing Matthew's perspective. A recent exception is the work of David C. Sim: *Apocalyptic eschatology in the gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88; Cambridge: University Press, 1996) 205-8; "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles," *JSNT* 57 (1995), and especially *Christian Judaism*, *passim*. Sim does acknowledge the importance of a post-war setting, but confines himself primarily to Antioch.

[116] This need not imply a setting for Matthew's community near Jerusalem, Judea or Galilee (even though some such setting is not intrinsically improbable). As Josephus indicates, the effects of the revolt were far-reaching and involved suffering for Jews throughout the diaspora (Cf. Josephus, *BJ* 7.407-46; he remarks that the war "had been felt by many even in the remotest parts" (*BJ* 7.408). See, further, Martin Goodman, "Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple" in Dunn, *Jews and Christians*, 28-33). Antioch is a possible setting, but, given the paucity of evidence in its favour, it is an assumption that has been far too uncritically accepted.

> strong fortresses overpowered, cities with well-manned defences completely mastered and an army pouring within the ramparts, an area all deluged with blood, the hands of those incapable of resistance raised in supplication, temples set on fire, houses pulled down over their owners' heads, and, after general desolation and woe, rivers flowing, not over a cultivated land, nor supplying drink to man and beast, but across a country still every side in flames. For to such sufferings were the Jews destined when they plunged into the war (*BJ* 7 143-45).

While some of these depictions are naturally stock images of military conquest (e.g., *temples* set on fire), Josephus' final application of them to the Jewish people suggests that they were probably not wide of the mark.

Thus, the revolt and its aftermath may help to account for Matthew's depiction of the crowds. If the Jewish people were indeed plunged into such sufferings, it is no wonder that Matthew characterises them as being destitute, leaderless and in need of healing. They had been horribly mistreated through following an errant leadership,[117] and were certainly in need of the healing and compassion that the followers of Jesus could offer them. Jesus' invitation at 11:28 for all to come to him assumes special poignancy, if these circumstances inform his invitation.

Such a context could also help to illumine the gospel's stress on the humility of Christ. Even though Matthew is emphatic about Jesus' Davidic descent, he is equally emphatic about Jesus' humility. Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and the temple is deliberately contrasted with the triumphal accession of David the conqueror. The conjunction of royalty with humility is an unexpected one, and it may well be that the conjunction of the two reflects the aftermath of the disastrous revolt. Matthew's apparent reluctance to style Jesus as a political messiah is expressive of a context where political messiahs would be only too redolent of the Jewish revolt, and of the pretenders, parvenus and would-be prophets who had led the nation into political suicide.[118] Hengel has suggested that such parvenus would have claimed Davidic descent as a matter of course.[119] If so, Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the therapeutic Son of David stands as a fitting corrective. His Son of David is not one who would lead his people into such a pit of destruction, but one who provides solace to those emerging from such circumstances. Matthew, then, has elaborated on

---

[117] That Ezekiel laments the situation of the Jewish people after the destruction of the first temple affords an instructive comparison with the situation of Matthew after the destruction of the Second Temple.

[118] Martin Hengel, *The Zealots* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989) 293-98.

[119] Hengel, *The Zealots*, 298-300.

earlier tradition to emphasize the humility and non-political nature of Jesus, the descendant of David.

To these features, one could further add Matthew's emphasis on the crowds' complicity in the death of Jesus. Davies and Allison note that, "If Matthew wrote after 70 AD, the choice between Barabbas the insurrectionist and the meek Christian Messiah who called for love of enemies would have been full of meaning."[120] As was argued above, the evangelist's accentuation of the crowds' choice of Barabbas is further rooted in his conviction that the destruction of Jerusalem was a direct consequence of Jesus' death, and that the crowds, their children and their leaders experienced divine retribution for the wrongful crucifixion of Jesus. God destroyed Jerusalem and the first temple because of Israel's impiety, and he had done so once again. Thus, Matthew's condemnation of the people is hardly unprecedented. It is well known that Josephus also theologizes about the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. He blames the exceptional impiety of his fellow citizens—"How much more impious are you than those who have been defeated in the past!"—and goes on to claim that, owing to this impiety, "the deity has fled from the holy places" and sided with the Romans (*BJ* 5.401, 412).

Thus—although naturally one cannot press the point—Matthew's ambivalence toward the crowds may well reflect his response to the people's situation in the aftermath of the revolt. On the one hand, he wishes them to assume some of the responsibility for God's act of judgement. On the other, he wants to stress Christ's continued compassion for them, and (through the church) God's willingness to provide them with healing and leadership.

F *Conclusion*

The foregoing discussion concluded that it is warranted to regard the crowds as transparent. Since both the Jewish leaders and the disciples appear to be interpreted in a transparent light, it is fitting that the crowds should be interpreted in the same way. The situation of the transparent crowds is akin to that of the historical crowds: they are Jewish and have not become members of the church. Nevertheless, Matthew appears to presuppose that the mission is ongoing, and, by providing different economies for the people and their leaders, evidently envisages a time when within the timing of God the transparent crowds will join the church. His gospel is, in part,

[120] DA III 586.

designed to help facilitate this process. In the meantime, Matthew's representation of the crowds highlights his ambivalent relation to Judaism and sanctions the church's claim to be the legitimate heir to the promises and traditions of Israel.

This page intentionally left blank

PART V

CONCLUSION

The Identity and Situation of the Crowds As Chapter One indicated, scholars have identified the transparent crowds in various ways. Some argued that no identification is required, since the crowds are historicized figures and not transparent. Others argued that they represented members of Matthew's community, while others yet held that they were figurative for the "Jews." None of these views is entirely accurate. The crowds do indeed represent Jews who have not joined Matthew's community. Nevertheless, they are perceived as being distinct from their leadership, and are regarded as having the potential to join the church. While their leadership has been categorically rejected, the people of Israel may yet be granted the understanding they lack. Their final status remains undetermined.

The Function of the Crowds: Heilsgeschichte Matthew's elaboration of a distinct economy for the people of Israel at 13:10-23 serves to justify the ongoing ministry to the people of Israel. Where the parable of the Vineyard indicates that the kingdom has been withdrawn from the Jewish leadership, the same does not hold true for the people. They, in contrast to their leaders, are not malign. They are simply without understanding. Thus, what emerges from the portrait here is largely the continuation of the salvation-historical trajectory already established at the historical level. It remains up to the people of Israel to choose which of their established trajectories they will follow.

Yet, if the people's final status remains in doubt, Matthew leaves no doubt about the status of the church. Regardless of whichever of the two trajectories the Jewish people choose, Jesus' church constitutes the fulfilment and culmination of all God's dealings with Israel. Matthew represents the transparent crowds—the people of Israel—as being co-heritors with the church. Yet, whether the people come to acknowledge that they are heirs, or remain oblivious of the fact does not appreciably alter the status of the church. It is the true heir.

The Function of the Crowds: Invitation and Apologetic Matthew's understanding of the crowds' place in salvation history means that he uses them for two main ends. First, Matthew uses the dual representations of the historical crowds to invite and admonish the people of Israel.

They are urged both directly and obliquely to come to a true understanding of the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to recognize Jesus as Lord. Second, Matthew uses the negative representation of the crowds to legitimate the church's status. The crowds furnish an apologia for the privileged position of the church within salvation history.

PART VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this work has been to provide a detailed examination of the crowds within Matthew's gospel. Its overall mandate was to determine their identity, role and function within the gospel. To address these issues, the first section set out to identify the crowds, and established that they are a distinct and relatively consistent entity, figuring, along with the disciples and Jewish leaders, as one of the main groups in the gospel. They are portrayed as being Jewish, and on occasion, as representative of Israel as distinct from its leaders.

Sections Two and Three addressed the roles of the crowds within the gospel, and specifically, the ambivalent portrayal of the crowds. Section Two assessed Jesus' ministry to the crowds, and their apparently favourable responses to this ministry. It concluded that Matthew draws on the familiar scriptural picture of Israel as a needy and leaderless flock to give content to the situation of the crowds. Jesus is depicted as the promised shepherd of Israel who will "shepherd his people" (2:6) and care for the ravaged flock of God (Ezek 34). The two images are designed to complement one another. In the company of Jesus, the crowds are marked by an increasing awareness of Jesus' identity, which effloresces in their identification of Jesus as "Son of David" in the Triumphal Entry. This narrative of the crowds shows them to be favourably disposed toward Jesus. Their attitude, however, is not expressive of any commitment to Jesus; rather, it arises out of their need. It also emerges from their identity as the people of Israel. They are attracted to Jesus because, as their promised, God-given leader, he is able to impart to them the blessings of the messianic age.

Section Three examined the unfavourable depiction of the crowds. Matthew again invokes a familiar scriptural topos, this time, one of a misunderstanding Israel that kills the prophets sent by God. The crowds spontaneously recognize Jesus as a prophet, but under the influence of their malign leaders in Jerusalem, they arrest him, and are persuaded to demand his crucifixion. They finish by joining with their leaders in assuming collective responsibility for Jesus' death. Here Matthew's narrative intensifies their complicity to illustrate their continuity with the image of prophet-killers. At the same time, Matthew has Jesus emphasize the crowds' lack of understanding. The

kingdom is taken from them because of their want of perception, not, as in the leaders' case, because they are wicked. The only time the crowds are portrayed in a distinctively negative light is when they serve as pawns of their leaders.

The ambivalence in Matthew's depiction of the crowds, therefore, arises from his identification of the crowds with the Jewish λαός. The Hebrew Scriptures provide the evangelist with both the positive and the negative topoi that he employs. The ambivalence of the portrayal is itself rooted in the idea of God's people that emerges from the Scriptures. To Matthew, the people of Israel are "sheep without a shepherd," the object of God's loving care, and the people with whom he chose to make a covenant. Nevertheless, they are also the people who continually ignore his ministrations, follow their corrupt leadership and go so far as to persecute his ministers, and to kill his prophets.

Matthew identifies the crowds, therefore, in each instance with Israel, and the crowds' antinomous roles emerge logically from this identification. One role is to represent a needy Israel instinctively gravitating toward Jesus, and receiving the ministrations of their shepherd, the Son of David. Their other role is misguidedly to reject the Messiah, whom God had sent to them. Taken together, these roles furnish a narrative of the crowds that describes the rise and fall of the Jewish populace of Jesus' day. Through both roles, the crowds recapitulate and epitomize the chequered history of Israel's involvement with Yahweh. Matthew is able to suggest thereby that the narrative of the crowds is but the most recent—if most decisive—instalment of that history.

The final section considered the question of the crowds' transparency. It determined that the crowds are not simply historicized characters, but are, in fact, portrayed transparently. They do not represent members of Matthew's community, but the Jewish people—as distinguished from their leaders—of Matthew's own day. They have not yet accepted the Christian proclamation, but their doing so remains a possibility that is deliberately courted by the evangelist. This state of affairs suggests that Matthew's construction of the crowds has two primary functions. The first is to induce the Jewish people of Matthew's day to join the church, either through invitation or invective. The second is to furnish an apologia, justifying the church as the legitimate heir to Israel's legacy.

What, then, are the implications of these findings? It was stated above in Chapter One that an appropriate understanding of the place of the crowds in Matthew's gospel should provide a new point of departure for (re-) assessing Matthew's relation to Judaism, his

Christology, and *Heilsgeschichte*. What does Matthew's treatment of the crowds suggest about these topics?

First of all, Matthew's treatment of the crowds demonstrates a considerable re-judaizing on Matthew's part. The evangelist represents Jesus' activity among the crowds as the outworking of a particularist ministry. Jesus is sent only to the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" and the crowds function as these very lost sheep. Matthew brings out this particularist dimension by having the crowds explicitly glorify "the God of Israel" and exclaim, "Never was anything like this seen in Israel." Matthew thereby gives a Jewish stamp to the entirety of Jesus' public ministry.

In addition to this synchronic perspective, Matthew adds a diachronic point of view. He situates the two representations of the crowds, both positive and negative, within the overall history of Israel. Both depictions show the crowds to be the present-day exemplars of the covenant people of God. As with the fulfilment citations, his purpose is to situate Jesus' ministry within the continuum of God's dealings with Israel.

The christological declarations made by the crowds reveal a similar Jewish orientation. They disclose Jesus' identity in its particular relation to Israel. It was established above that the title Son of David is, for Matthew, the characteristic title of Jesus' ministry to Israel. The crowds, in making this declaration, ratify Jesus as the Davidid prophesied by Ezekiel, who would shepherd the leaderless flock of Israel. The title's frequency within the gospel attests to its importance for the evangelist, although the fact that the suppliants move on to "Lord" suggests a situation that transcends the Jewish ministry. The crowds' identification of Jesus as a prophet naturally displays a Jewish focus as well. Here, by invoking the topos of the violent fate of the prophets, Matthew contextualizes Jesus' ministry within the trajectory of God's dealings with Israel—and their response to God's dealings.

This re-judaization is designed to illustrate the outworking of *Heilsgeschichte* within the context of Israel. The narrative of the crowds helps to demonstrate that Jesus was indeed the predicted Messiah of Israel, and that he did indeed fulfil his prophesied ministry to Israel. Ultimately, though, it shows how the Messiah was rejected by his people. The crowds side with their obdurate leaders and together, as the people of Israel, relinquish their status as the people of God.

This salvation-historical trajectory serves as the foundation for the two functions noted above: apology and invitation. First, it provides Matthew with an apologia, justifying the current status of the church. Matthew's dual economy, encompassing Israel as a whole (21:43 with

13:10-23), indicates that the kingdom has moved to a new people, and that the privileged status of the Jewish people has been revoked. This revocation is evidently permanent for the Jewish leadership. In their place, the church has become the legitimate arbiter of and heir to the traditions of Israel. Second, the above trajectory provides the basis for the gospel's invitation. Matthew's dual economy suggests that the people of Israel are still capable of assuming their place as legitimate heirs, and indicates that the gospel is still aimed at the people of Israel—the "crowds" of Matthew's own day. This mission to the people of Israel is ongoing. While it appears to be experiencing little success, Matthew, like Paul, evidently hopes that the people will recover from their deficient understanding, and take their place among the church as a whole.

For the moment, however, Matthew is embroiled in an acute conflict with the leaders of emergent formative Judaism for the allegiance of the Jewish people. To repeat the analogy used above, Matthew and the leadership of emergent Judaism have undergone an acrimonious divorce. Each regards itself as the legitimate parent to the people of Israel, and seeks to gain custody. This circumstance helps to explain why it has proved so difficult to determine Matthew's precise relationship to Judaism. Matthew has irrevocably broken with the leadership but not with the people as a whole.

Thus, to answer the time-honoured question of whether Matthew's situation is *intra-* or *extra-muros*, one would have to reply that it is *extra-muros* but very much focussed on those who are still *intra-muros*. Matthew is standing outside, trying to pull his charges out of the building. His charges, however, remain characteristically ambivalent.

PART VII

APPENDIX

4.25 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

5.1 Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·

7.28 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· 7.29 ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

8.1 Καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.

8.18 Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄχλον περὶ αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

9.8 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

9.23 Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον

9.25 ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον.

9.33 καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες, Οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

9.36 Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

11.7 Τούτων δὲ πορευομένων ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου, Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον;

[12.15] Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ [ὄχλοι] πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας

12.23 καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον, Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ;

12.46 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἱστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι.

13.2 καὶ συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἱστήκει.

13.34 Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς

13.36 Τότε ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, Διασάφησον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν τῶν ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ.

14.5 καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

14.13 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ᾽ ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

14.14 καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν. 14.15 ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες, Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρῆλθεν· ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.

14.19 καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

14.22 Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους.

14.23 καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ᾽ ἰδίαν προσεύξασθαι. ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ.

15.10 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε·

15.30 καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἔχοντες μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν χωλούς, τυφλούς, κυλλούς, κωφούς, καὶ ἑτέρους πολλοὺς καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς·

15.31 ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι βλέποντας κωφοὺς λαλοῦντας, κυλλοὺς ὑγιεῖς καὶ χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας· καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ.

15.32 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν· καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

15.33 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον;

15.35 καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν

15.36 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

15.37 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν. καὶ τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ἦραν ἑπτὰ σπυρίδας πλήρεις.

15.39 Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν.

17.14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν

19.2 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ.

20.29 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἰεριχὼ ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς.

20.31 ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν· οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

21.8 ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἐστρώννυον ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

21.9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον λέγοντες, Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

21.11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

21.26 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην.

21.46 καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

22.33 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

23.1 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ

26.47 Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ.

26.55 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις, Ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων συλλαβεῖν με; καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με.

27.15 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον ὃν ἤθελον.

27.20 Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν.

27.24 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πιλᾶτος ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θόρυβος γίνεται, λαβὼν ὕδωρ ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας ἀπέναντι τοῦ ὄχλου λέγων, Ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τούτου· ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε.

PART VIII

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A *Reference Works*

Aland, K. et al. (ed.). *The Greek New Testament.* 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993.

Aland, Kurt (ed.). *Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament.* Band II *Spezialübersichten.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.

Bachmann, H. and W. A. Slaby. *Computer-Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece von Nestle-Aland 26 Auflage, und zum Greek New Testament.* 3. Auf. Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung und vom Rechenzentrum der Universität. Münster. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.

Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testamentand other Early Christian Literature.* 2nd ed. London/Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider (eds.). *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-93 (*Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* 3 Vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1981-83).

Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Cambridge: University Press., 1968.

Brown, Colin et al., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.* 3 Vols. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1975-8.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 Vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Freedman, David N. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* 6 Vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich (eds.). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1964-76.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th Edition with a revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1994.

Morgenthaler, Robert. *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes.* 3. Auf. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, (1958) 1982.

Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906-1976.

Nestle E. and K. Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* 26. Auf. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.

Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* 3rd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.

Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* 5 Vols. 5. Auf. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1965.

Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
Wissawa G. (ed.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1958.

B *Commentaries on Matthew*

Albright, W. F. and C. S. Mann. *Matthew*. AB 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
Allen, Willoughby, C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. ICC. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907.
Beare, Frank W. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Blomberg, Craig L. *Matthew*. The New American Commentary 22. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
Carson, D. A. *Matthew*. The Expositors Bible Commentary. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
Davies, Margaret, *Matthew*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison Jr. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997.
Fenton, J. C. *The Gospel of Saint Matthew*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
Gaechter, Paul. *Das Matthäus Evangelium*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963.
Garland, David E. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2 Vols. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1986, 1988.
Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament I. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt (1968) 1981.
Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina I. Collegeville; Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1991.
Hagner, Donald. *Matthew 1-13* and *Matthew 14-28*. WBC 33A,B. Dallas: Word, 1993, 1995.
Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972.
Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
Lagrange, M.-J. *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu*. Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1923.
Lohmeyer, Ernst, and Werner Schmauch, (ed.). *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. 4. Auf. Meyer Kommentar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1956) 1967.
Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7. A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

—, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: Mt 8-17*. EKKNT 1/2. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1990.
—, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: Mt 18-25*. EKKNT 1/3. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1997.
McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan, 1915.
Patte, Daniel. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäu*s. Regensberger Neues Testament I. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1986.
Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel seine Selbstständigkeit*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1957.
Schnackenburg, R. *Matthäusevangelium 1:1-16:20*. Die Neue Echter Bibel I. Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985.
Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Matthew*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
Senior, Donald. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
Trilling, W. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. 2 vols. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
Wellhausen, J. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904.

C *Monographs and Essays*

Abegg, Martin G. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 125-144.
Achtemeier, Paul J. "The Lukan Perpective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch" in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978, 153-67.
Aerts, T.L. "Suivre Jésus: Evolution d'un théme biblique dans les évangiles synoptiques." *ETL* 42 (1966) 476-512.
Aharoni, Yohanan. *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Matt. 23.39 = Luke 13.35b as a Conditional Prophecy." *JSNT* 18 (1983) 75-84.
—, "Matthew: Structure, Biographical Impulse and the *Imitatio Christi*" in Van Segbroeck et al., *The Four Gospels*, 1203-1221.
—, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
Alt, Albrecht. *Where Jesus Worked*. London: Epworth, 1961.
Anderson, Janice Capel. "Matthew: Sermon and Story" in Bauer aand Powell, *Treasures*, 233-50.
—, *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*. JSNTSup 91. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
Annen, F. "θαυμάζω." *EDNT* II 134-35.
Arens, Eduardo. *The ΗΛΘΟΝ-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation*. OBO 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
Arnal, William. "Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist's Preaching in Q 3:7-9, 16-17" in J. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and Invention*, 165-180.

Ascough, Richard. "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton." *CBQ* 58 (1996) 69-81.

Ashton, John. *Studying John. Approaches to the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Avi-Yonah, M. "Historical Geography of Palestine" in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Fortress: Philadelphia, 1974. Vol. I 78-116.

Balch, David (ed.). *Social History of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Balz, Horst. "ἐκπλήσσομαι." *EDNT* I 420.

—, "μήτι." *EDNT* II 426.

—, "ὄχλος." *EDNT* II 553-54.

—, "συνίημι." *EDNT* III 307-8.

—, "φοβέομαι." *EDNT* III 429-32.

—, "φόβος κτλ." *TDNT* IX 189-219.

Bammel, Ernst. "The Feeding of the Multitude" in Bammel and Moule (eds.), *Politics*, 211-240.

Bammel, E. and C. F. D. Moule (eds.). *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*. Cambridge: University Press, 1984.

Barr, David L. "The Drama of Matthew's Gospel." *Theology Digest* 24 (1976) 349-59.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd Ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1978.

Barth, Gerhard. "Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen Evangelien." *ZTK* 72 (1975) 269-92.

—, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law" in G. Bornkamm et al., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 58-164.

—, "ὀλιγοπιστία." *EDNT* II 506.

Bartlett, J. Vernon. *The Gospel of St. Mark*. The Century Bible. Edinburgh: T.C.&E.C. Jack, n.d.

Bauckham, Richard (ed.). *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Bauer, David R. "The Major Characters of Matthew's Story." *Int* 46 (1992) 363-65.

—, "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel" in Bauer and Powell, *Treasures*, 129-59.

Bauer, David R. and Mark Allen Powell, *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Symposium Series 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Beaton, Richard. "Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42:1-4?" *JSNT* 75 (1999) 5-23.

Becker, Hans-Jürgen. "Die Zerstörung Jerusalems bei Matthäus und den Rabbinen." *NTS* 44 (1998) 59-73.

Berger, Klaus. *Die Amen-Worte Jesu. Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Legitimation in apocalyptischer Rede*. BZNW 39. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.

—, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments." *NTS* 20 (1974) 1-44.

Bertram, Georg. “θαῦμα κτλ.” *TDNT* III 27-42.
Best, Ernest. “The Role of the Disciples in Mark.” *NTS* 23 (1977) 377-401.
Betz, Hans Dieter. *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
—, *Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
—, “The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matt 11:28-30).” *JBL* 86 (1967) 10-24.
—, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament*. BHT 37. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967.
Betz, Otto. *Offenbarung und Schrifterforschung in der Qumransekte*. WUNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
Betz, Otto, et al. (eds.). *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel*. AGSU 5. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
Beutler, Johannes and Fortna, Robert T. (eds.). *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context*. SNTSMS 67. Cambridge: University Press, 1991.
Bietenhard, Hans. “People.” *NIDNTT* II 800-801.
—, “Die syrische Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Trajan.” *ANRW* II 8, 220-261.
Birdsall, J. Neville. “A note on the textual evidence for the omission of Matthew 9:34” in Dunn, *Jews and Christians*, 117-122.
Black, II, C. Clifton. “Depth of Characterization and Degrees of Faith in Matthew.” *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 604-23.
Blackburn, B. *Theios Anêr and the Markan Miracle Traditions*. WUNT 2/40. Tübingen: Mohr, 1991.
Blendinger, L. “ Disciple.” *NIDNTT* I 480-83.
Blinzler, J., et al. (eds.). *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963.
Block, Daniel I. “Bringing Back David: Ezekiel’s Messianic Hope” in Philip E. Satterthwaite et al., *The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995, 167-88.
Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd Ed. Chicago: University Press, 1983.
Bornkamm, G. “μυστήριον κτλ.” *TDNT* IV 802-28.
—, “End-Expectation and Church in Matthew” in G. Bornkamm et al., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 15-51.
—, “The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus” in G. Bornkamm et al., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 301-27.
—, “The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew,” in G. Bornkamm et al., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 52-57.
Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H. J. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. NTL. 2nd Ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
Boucher, Madeline. *The Mysterious Parable. A Literary Study*. CBQMS 6. Washington: C.B.A.A., 1977.
Bowman, Alan K. *Egypt after the Pharaohs, 332BC-AD642*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
Bowsher, J. M. C. “Architecture and Religion in the Decapolis: A Numismatic Survey.” *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 199 (1987) 62-69.
Brandon, S. G. F. *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth*. London: Batsford, 1968.

Brawley, Robert L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation.* SBLMS 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
Broer, I. "Versuch zur Christologie des ersten Evangeliums" in F. Van Segbroeck et al. *The Four Gospels.* Vol 2. 1251-1282.
Broshi, Magen. "The Population of Western Palestine in the Roman-Byzantine Period." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 236 (1980) 1-10.
Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke.* 2nd Ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
—, *The Death of the Messiah.* 2 Vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
—, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind.* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984.
—, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *MYSTERION.*" *Bib* 39 (1958) 426-481.
Brown, Raymond E. and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome. New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity.* New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
Brown, Schuyler. "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission." *NovT* 22 (1980) 193-221.
—, "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 9:35-11:1)." *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90.
—, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel." *ST* 31 (1977) 21-32.
Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition.* Revised Ed. with 1963 suppl. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
Burger, Christoph. *Jesus als Davidssohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
—, "Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9." *ZTK* 70 (1973) 272-87.
Burnett, Fred W. *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew.* Washington: University Press of America, 1981.
Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography.* SNTSMS 70. Cambridge: University Press, 1992.
Cargal, Timothy B. "'His Blood be Upon Us and Upon Our Children.'" *NTS* 37 (1991) 101-112.
Carlston, Charles E. "Christology and Church in Matthew" in Van Segbroeck et al.,
The Four Gospels. Vol. 2, 1283-1304.
—, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
—, "The Things That Defile (Mark VII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark." *NTS* 15 (1969) 75-96.
Carter, Warren. "The Crowds in Matthew' Gospel." *CBQ* 55 (1993) 54-67.
—, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
—, "Matthew 4:18-22 and Matthean Discipleship: An Audience-Oriented Perspective." *CBQ* 59 (1997) 58-75.
—, "Narrative/Literary Approaches to Matthean Theology: The 'Reign of the Heavens' as an Example (Mt. 4.17-5.12)." *JSNT* 67 (1997) 3-27.
Carter, Warren and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives.* CBQMS 30. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998.

Charette, Blaine. "A Harvest for the People? An Interpretation of Matthew 9.37f." *JSNT* 38 (1990) 29-35.
—, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel.* JSNTSup 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
Charlesworth, James (ed.). *The Messiah.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
—, Review of Joachim Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos: Eine Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts.* ALGHJ 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977 in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50 (1982) 292-293.
—, "The Son of David: Solomon and Jesus" in P. Borgen and S. Giverson (eds.), *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1995, 72-87
Chilton, Bruce D. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum.* JSOTSup 23. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
—, Ed. and tr. *The Isaiah Targum.* The Aramaic Bible Vol. 11. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
Christ, Felix. *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern.* Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1970.
Citron, Bernhard. "The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels." *SJT* 7 (1954) 408-18.
Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature.* New York: Doubleday, 1995.
—, "The Works of the Messiah." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994) 98-112.
Comber, Joseph A. "The Verb *Therapeuô* in Matthew's Gospel." *JBL* 97 (1978) 431-34.
Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie der Lukas.* 5. Auf. BHT 17. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
—, "συνίημι κτλ." *TDNT* VII 888-896.
Cooke, G. A. *Ezekiel.* ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.
Cope, E. M. (ed.). *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary.* Rev. J. E. Sandys. 3 Vols. New York: Arno, (1877) 1973.
Cope, Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven.* CBQMS 5. Washington: C.B.A.A., 1976.
Cotter, Wendy, *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook.* London: Routledge, 1999.
Cousland, J. R. C. "The Feeding of the four thousand *Gentiles* in Matthew? Matthew 15:29-29 as a Test Case." *NovT* 61 (1999) 1-23.
Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament.* 2nd Ed. London: SCM, 1963.
—, *Petrus. Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer. Das historische und das theologische Petrusproblem.* Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1952.
Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
Cumont, Franz. "The Population of Syria." *Journal of Roman Studies* 24 (1934) 187-190.
Dahl, Nils, A. "The Passion Narrative in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation,* 42-55.
Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.* London: The Athlone Press, 1956.

Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
—, "The Jewish Sources of Matthew's Messianism" in Charlesworth, *Messiah*, 494-511.
—, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.
Delling, Gerhard. "πλῆθος κτλ." *TDNT* VI 274-283.
Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30*. JSNTSup 18. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.
—, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus, and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996.
Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
Didier, M. (ed.). *L'évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et Théologie*. BETL 29. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1972.
Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 19-29.
Dodd, C. H. "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet" in G. K. D. Bell and A. Deissman (eds.), *Mysterium Christi*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930, 53-66.
Donahue, John R. *The Gospel in Parable*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.
—, "Redaction Criticism: Has the *Hauptstrasse* become a *Sackgasse*?" in E. V. McKnight and E. Struthers Malbon (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1994, 27-47.
Donaldson, Terence L. "Guiding Readers—Making Disciples: Discipleship in Matthew's Narrative Strategy" in Richard N. Longenecker (ed.), *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996, 30-49.
—, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria: Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
Doyle, B. R. "'Crowds' in Matthew: Texts and Theology." *Catholic Theological Review* 6 (1984) 28-33.
Draper, Jonathan A. "The Genesis and Narrative Thrust of the Paraenesis in the Sermon on the Mount." *JSNT* 75 (1999) 25-48.
Drury, John. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
Duguid, Iain. *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel*. VTSup 56. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Duling, Dennis C. "Matthew and Marginality." *SBL Seminar Papers 1993*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993, 642-71.
—, "Solomon, Exorcism and Son of David." *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-52.
—, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic." *NTS* 24 (1978) 392-410.
Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. London: SCM, 1980.
—, (ed). *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. WUNT 66. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
—, *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM, 1991.
—, "The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period" in *idem* (ed.), *Jews and Christians*, 177-211.

Dupont, Jacques "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste" (Mt 11, 2-6, Lk 7, 18-23). *NRTh* 83 (1961) 805-821, 943-959.
—, *Les Béatitudes. La Bonne Nouvelle.* Vol. II. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
—, "Le Chapitre des Paraboles." *NRTh* 89 (1967) 800-820.
—, "Le point de vue de Matthieu dans le chapitre des paraboles" in Didier, *L'évangile*, 221-59.
Dwyer, Timothy. *The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark.* JSNTSup 128. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
Eckert, W., et al. (eds.). *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge.* Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967.
Edwards, James R. "The Use of ΠΡΟΣΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ in the Gospel of Matthew." *JBL* 106 (1987) 65-74.
Edwards, Richard A. *Matthew's Narrative Portrait of the Disciples: How the Text-Connoted Reader is Informed.* Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1997.
—, *The Sign of Jonah: The Theology of the Evangelists and Q.* SBT. Second Series 18. London: SCM, 1971.
—, "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples" in Fernando Segovia (ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament.* Philadephia: Fortress, 1985, 47-61.
Eichholz, Georg. *Auslegung der Bergpredigt.* 3. Auf. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1975.
Eichrodt, W. *Ezekiel: A Commentary.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
Elderen, Bastiaan van. "The Purpose of Parables According to Matthew 13:10-17" in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 180-90.
Ellis, E. Earle. "Prophecy in the New Testament Church and Today" in J. Panagopoulos (ed.), *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today.* NovT-Sup 45. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
Field, D. H. "Ecstasy, etc." *NIDNTT* I 529-30.
Fischel, H. A. "Martyr and Prophet." *JQR* 37 (1946-47) 265-280, 363-86.
Fisher, Loren R. "Can this be the Son of David?" in F. Thomas Trotter (ed.), *Jesus and the Historian.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968, 82-97.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Anti-Semitism and the Cry of 'All the People' (Mt 27:25)." *TS* 26 (1965) 667-71.
—, "Aramaic Evidence Affecting the Interpretation of *Hosanna* in the New Testament" in G. F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1987, 110-18.
—, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX.* AB 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
—, "κύριος." *EDNT* II 328-31.
—, "The Son of David Tradition and Matt. 22:41-46 and Parallels." *Concilium* 10 (1966) 40-46.
Flender, Helmut. "Lehren und Verkundigung in den synoptischen Evangelien." *EvT* 25 (1965) 701-14.
Foerster, Werner. "ὄρος." *TDNT* V 475-87.
Foerster, Werner et al. "σώζω κτλ." *TDNT* VII 965-1024.
Forster, E. M. *The Aspects of the Novel.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, (1927) 1964.
France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.

Frankemölle, Hubert. *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974.
—, "λαός." *EDNT* II 339-44.
Freyne, Seán. "Galilee (Hellenistic/Roman)." *ABD* II 895-899.
—, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian. 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980.
—, *The Twelve: Disciples and Apostles. A Study in the Theology of the First Three Gospels*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.
Friedrich, G. "κηρῦξ." *TDNT* III 683-718.
Friedrich, G. et al. "προφήτης κτλ." *TDNT* VI 781-861.
Friedrich, J. H. "πρόβατον." *EDNT* III 152-53.
Fuchs, Albert. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beiträge zur Quellenkritik*. AnBib 49. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
Fuller, Reginald H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
—, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.
Garland, David E. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. NovTSup 52. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
Gaston, Lloyd. "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles: The Setting of Matthew's Christology." *Int* 29 (1975) 24-40.
Genette, Gérard. *Fiction & Diction*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1993.
Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Mighty Acts of Jesus According to Matthew*. Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1978-79. Lund: CSK, Gleerup, 1979.
—, *The Testing of God's Son: An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash*. CBNT 2:1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
Gibbs, James M. "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David.'" *NTS* 10 (1964) 446-64.
—, "The Son of God as the Torah Incarnate in Matthew." SE IV=*TU* 102 (1968) 38-46.
Giesen, Heinz. "Jesu Krankenheilungen im Verständnis des Matthäusevangeliums" in Ludger Schenke (ed.), *Studien des Matthäusevangeliums*. Stuttgart: KBW, 1988, 79-106.
Gils, Félix. *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957.
Gnilka, Joachim. *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. SANT 3. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1961.
Goodman, Martin. "Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple" in Dunn, *Jews and Christians*, 27-38.
Goodspeed, E. J. *Problems of New Testament Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
Goppelt, Leonhard. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, 1982.
Goulder, Michael D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
Grässer, Erich. "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI.1-6a). Notes on the Redaction & Theology of St. Mark." *NTS* 16 (1970) 1-23.
Green, William Scott. "Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question" in J.

Neusner et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: University Press, 1987, 1-13.
Grimm, W. "θεραπεύω." *EDNT* II 143-144.
Gubler, Marie-Louise. *Die frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu: Eine motivgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1977.
Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC 34A. Dallas: Word, 1989.
—, *The Sermon on the Mount. A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, Texas: Wood, 1982.
Gundry, R. H. *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993.
—, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. NovTSup 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
—, "On True and False Disciples in Matthew 8:18-22." *NTS* 40 (1994) 433-41.
Gutbrod, Walter et al. "Ἰσραήλ." *TDNT* III 356-91.
Haas, Peter. "The Am Ha'Arets as Literary Character" in J. Neusner et al. (eds.), *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Intellect in Quest of Understanding*. Vol. 2. BJS 173. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 139-53.
Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.
Hagner, Donald. "Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (*Matthew 13:1-52*)" in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, 102-24.
—, "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel of Matthew" in David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell (eds.), *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996, 27-68.
Hahn, F. *Christologische Hoheitstitel: ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
—, *Mission in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1965.
Hare, Douglas R. A. "How Jewish Is the Gospel of Matthew?" *CBQ* 62 (2000) 264-77.
—, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
Hare, Douglas R. A. and Daniel Harrington. "Make Disciples of All the Gentiles (Mt 28:19)." *CBQ* 37 (1975) 359-69.
Harvey, A.E. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.
Harvey, Graham. *The True Israel: Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. AGJU 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Hawkins, Sir John. *Horae Synopticae*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
Head, Peter M. *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority*. Cambridge: University Press, 1997.
Heard, Warren J. "Magadan." *ABD* IV 463.
Hedinger, Ulrich. "Jesus und die Volksmenge." *TZ* 32 (1976) 201-206.
Hegermann, H. "δοξάζω." *EDNT* I 348-49.
Heil, John Paul. *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

—, "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and the Sheep in Matthew." *CBQ* 55 (1993) 698-708.
—, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt. 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21*. An Bib 87. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.
—, "Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew." *CBQ* 41 (1979) 274-87.
Held, Heinz Joachim. "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories" in G. Bornkamm et al., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 165-299.
Hengel, Martin. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
—, "The Geography of Palestine in Acts" in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting. Volume 4: Palestinian Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 27-78.
—, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*. London: SCM, 1989.
—, "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund." *TRu* 52 (1987) 327-400.
—, *The Zealots*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
Hill, David. *New Testament Prophecy*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
—, "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology." *JSNT* 6 (1980) 2-16.
Hitzig, F. *Der Prophet Ezechiel erklärt*. Leipzig, 1847.
Hoffman, Paul et al. (eds.). *Orientierung an Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.
Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. BNTC. London: Hendrickson, 1991.
Horsley, Richard A. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.
—, "Like One of the Prophets of Old: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-63.
—, "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins." *JSNT* 26 (1986) 3-27.
Howell, David B. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. JSNTSup 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
Hubaut, Michel. *La Parabole des Vignerons Homicides*. Paris: Gabalda, 1976.
Hübner, Hans. *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition*. 2. Auf. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
Hull, John M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. SBT 28. London: SCM, 1974.
A. J. Hultgren. "Liturgy and Literature: The Liturgical Factor in Matthew's Literary and Communicative Art" in T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm (eds.), *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995, 659-73.
—, *The Parables of Jesus. A Commentary*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000.
Hummel, R. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäus-Evangelium*. 2. Auf. BEvT 33. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966.
Iersel, B. Van. "Die wunderbar Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition." *NovT* 7 (1964) 167-94.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
—, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
—, "Μωυσῆς." *TDNT* IV 848-73.
—, *The Parables of Jesus*. Rev. Ed. London: SCM, 1972.
Johnson, Marshall D. *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*. 2nd Ed. SNTSMS 8. Cambridge: University Press, 1988.
Jones, A. H. M. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. 2nd Ed. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1983.
Jones, Ivor Harold. *The Matthean Parables. A Literary and Historical Commentary*. NovTSup 80. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
Jouon, P. "ΟΧΛΟΣ au sens de 'Peuple, Population' dans le Grec du Nouveau Testament et dans la Lettre d'Aristeé." *RSR* 27 (1937) 618-19.
Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2 Vols. Freiburg: Mohr, 1899.
Justin Martyr. *Writings of Saint Justin Martyr. The Fathers of the Church*. Tr. Thomas B. Falls. New York: Christian Heritage, 1948.
Käsemann, Ernst. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" in *idem*, *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM, 1969, 82-107.
Kaminsky, Joel S. *Corporate Responsibility in the Hebrew Bible*. JSOTSup 196. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
Karpinski, Richard. *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ: à la base de l'enseignement de Jésus et de la mission apostolique selon S. Matthieu*. Rome: Institut des Recherches Ecclésiastiques, 1961.
Kasting, Heinrich. *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission: Ein historische Untersuchung*. BEvT 55. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1969.
Kastner, P. Josef M. *Moses im neuen Testament*. Inaugural Dissertation: Ludwig- Maximilians Universität: Munich, 1967.
Kee, Howard. *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times*. SNTSMS 55. Cambridge: University Press, 1986.
Keegan, Terence J. "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses." *CBQ* 44 (1982) 415-25.
Kessler, Hans. *Die Theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1970.
Kilpatrick, G. D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew as Story*. 2nd Ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
—, *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.
—, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism*. London: SPCK, 1969.
—, "The Rhetoric of Comprehension in the Gospel of Matthew." *NTS* 41 (1995) 358-77.
—, "The Title 'KYRIOS' in Matthew's Gospel." *JBL* 94 (1975) 246-55.
—, "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel." *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602.
—, "The Verb AKOLOUTHEIN ('to follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of his Community." *JBL* 97 (1978) 56-73.
Kittel, Gerhard. "ἀκολουθέω." *TDNT* I 210-216.
—, "δοκέω κτλ." *TDNT* II 232-55.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten.* NTAbh 13. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.
—, "Die Frage der Sündenvergebung in der Perikope von der Heilung des Gelähmten (Mk 2:1-12 parr.)." *BZ* 25 (1981) 223-48.
Klein, Hans. *Bewährung im Glauben: Studien zum Sondergut des Evangelisten Matthäus.* BThSt 26. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1996.
Klein, R. W. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message.* Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1988.
Kloppenborg, John S. (ed.). *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q.* Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995.
—, *The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
—, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance.* Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
Koch, K. "Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53 – Targum. Beitrag zu der Praxis der aramäischen Bibelübersetzung." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 3 (1972) 117-48.
Kodell, Jerome. "Luke's use of *Laos* 'People' especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19:28-24:53)." *CBQ* 31 (1969) 327-43.
Koester, H. "σπλάγχνον." *TDNT* VII 548-549.
Kopp, Clemens. *Die Heiligen Stätten der Evangelien.* Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1959.
Kosmala, H. "His Blood on Us and on Our Children (the Background of Matt. 27:24-25)." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 7 (1970) 94-126.
Krentz, Edgar. "Community and Character: Matthew's Vision of the Church." *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, 565-73.
Kretzer, Armin. *Die Herrschaft der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Basileabegriff und Basileaverständnis im Matthäusevangelium.* SBM 10. Stuttgart: Echter KBW, 1971.
Krieger, K. S. "Das Publikum der Bergpredigt (Mt 4, 23-25). Ein Beitrage zu der Frage: Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?" *Kairos* 28 (1986) 98-119.
Künzel, Georg. *Studien zum Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäus-Evangeliums.* Calwer Theologische Monographien. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1978.
Kuhli, H. " Ἰσραήλ." *EDNT* II 202-4.
Kuhn, H.-W. "σταυρός." *EDNT* III 267-70.
Kupp, David D. *Matthew's Emmanuel. Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel.* SNTSMS 90. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.
Lachs, Samuel Tobias. *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke.* Hoboken: KTAV Publishing House, 1987.
Lambrecht, Jan. "ἐξίστημι." *EDNT* II 7-8.
—, *Ich Aber Sage Euch: Die Bergpredigt als programatische Rede Jesu Mt 5-7, Lk 6:20-49.* Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.
—, *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew.* Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 10. Louvain: Peeters, 1992.
Lange, Joachim. *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Matthäus.* Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973.
Légasse, S. *Jésus et l'enfant.* Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
—, "Les Miracles de Jésus selon Matthieu" in X. Leon-Dufour (ed.), *Les Miracles de Jésus selon le Nouveau Testament.* Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1977, 227-47.

Le Moyne, Jean. *Les Sadducéens*. Paris: Gabalda, 1972.
Leon-Dufour, Xavier. *Etudes d'évangile*. Paris: Le Seuil, 1965.
—, "Mt et Mc dans le Récit de la Passion." *Biblica* 40 (1959) 684-86.
Levine, Amy-Jill. "Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of Matthew" in William R. Farmer (ed.), *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999, 9-36.
—, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1988.
Lightfoot, Robert Henry. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM, 1961.
Loader, W. R. C. "Son of David, Blindness, Possession, and Duality in Matthew." *CBQ* 44 (1982) 570-85.
Lodge, David, "Crowds and Power in the Early Victorian Novel" in *idem*, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1990, 100-15.
Lohfink, Gerhard. "Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?" *TQ* 163 (1983) 264-84.
Lohse, Eduard. "ὡσαννά." *TDNT* IX 682-84.
—, "υἱὸς Δαυίδ." *TDNT* VIII 478-488.
Loos, H. van der. *The Miracles of Jesus*. NovTSup 8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
Lovsky, F. "Comment comprendre 'son sang sur nous et nos enfants?'" *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses* 62 (1987) 343-62.
Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. WMANT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969.
Luz, U. "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 98-128.
—, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.
Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers." *NovT* 28 (1986) 104-30.
Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. AB 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
Martin, Francis. "The Image of the Shepherd in the Gospel of Sant [*sic*] Matthew." *Science et Esprit* 27 (1975) 261-301.
Martínez, Florentino García and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd Ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
Matera, Frank J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
—, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories*. Theological Inquiries. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.
McCarter, P. Kyle. *II Samuel*. AB 9. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
McHugh, John. *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975.
Meier, John P. "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel." *JBL* 99 (1980) 383-405.
—, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17-48*. AnBib 71. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
—, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102.

Mendels, Doron. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 15. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Menken, M. J. J. "The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew (Mt 2,17; 16,14; 27,9)." *ETL* 60 (1984) 5-24.

Menninger, Richard E. *Israel and the Church in the Gospel of Matthew*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

Merk, Otto. "κηρύσσω κτλ." *EDNT* II 288-92.

Meye, Robert P. *Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Meyer, Rudolf. "ὄχλος." *TDNT* V 582-90.

—, *Der Prophet aus Galilëa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelisten*. Leipzig, 1940.

Miler, Jean. *Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile de Matthieu*. Analecta Biblica 140. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999.

Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Jerome Lectures 22. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

—, *The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Minear, Paul S. "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology" in H. Baltensweiler (ed.), *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972, 79-90.

—, "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew." *AThR* Supp. Ser. 3. (1974) 28-44.

—, "False Prophecy and Hypocrisy in the Gospel of Matthew" in Joachim Gnilka (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche*. Freiburg: Herder, 1974, 76-93.

—, "Jesus' Audiences According to Luke." *NovT* 16 (1974) 81-109.

Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

—, "Nazarene and Nazareth." Appendix B in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the* Apostles, Vol. 1. Prolegomena I. *The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds*. London: Macmillan, 1920, 426-32.

Mora, Vincent. *Le Refus d'Israël: Matthieu, 27:25*. LD 124. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1986.

Moses, A. D. A. *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy*. JSNTSup 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Mosley, A. W. "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke." *NTS* 10 (1964) 139-49.

Moule, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. London: A. & C. Black, 1962.

—, *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: University Press, 1977.

Müller, D. "Der gute Hirte: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte ägyptischer Bildrede." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 86 (1961) 126-44.

Mueller, James R. *The Five Fragments of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel: A Critical Study*. JSPSup 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Mundle, W. "Ecstasy, etc." *NIDNTT* I 527-528.

—, "Fear, Awe." *NIDNTT* I 621-24.

—, "Miracle, etc." *NIDNTT* II 620-26.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Structure of Matthew 14-17." *RB* 82 (1975) 360-84.

Neirynck, Frans. "Literary Criticism: Old and New" in Camille Focant (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. BETL 110. Leuven: University Press, 1993, 11-38.

—, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark: with a Cumulative List*. BETL 37. Leuven: University Press, 1974.

—, "La rédaction Matthéene et la structure du premier évangile." *ETL* 43 (1967) 41-73.

Neubauer, Adolphe. *La Géographie du Talmud*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.

Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds.). *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: University Press, 1987.

Neyrey, Jerome H. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

—, "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42,1-4 in Matthew 12." *Bib* 63 (1982) 457-73.

Nolan, Brian M. *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. OBO 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. WBC 35B. Dallas: Word, 1993.

—, "No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25." *JSNT* 62 (1996) 3-12.

Normann, Friedrich. *Christos Didaskalos: Die Vorstellung von Christus als Lehrer in der christlichen Literatur des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 32. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.

Oepke, Albrecht. "ἔκστασις κτλ." *TDNT* II 449-60.

Ogawa, Akira. *L'histoire de Jésus chez Matthieu: La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie Matthéenne*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1979.

Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. JSPSup 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Oppenheimer, Aharon. *The 'Am Ha-Aretz': A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. ALGHJ 8. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Orton, David. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. JSNTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Overman, J. Andrew. *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew*. The New Testament in Context. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996.

—, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of Matthean Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Panagopoulos, J. (ed.). *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*. NovTSup 45. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Patsch, Hermann. "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem." *ZTK* 68 (1976) 1-26.

Pedersen, Siegfried. "Die Proklamation Jesu als des eschatologischen Offenbarungsträgers (Mt 17:1-13)." *NovT* 17 (1975) 241-64.

Perels, Otto. *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung*. BWANT 12. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934.

Perrot, Charles. "Un prophète comme l'un des prophètes (Mc 6:15)" in Maurice Carrez et al. (eds.), *De la Torah au Messie*. Paris: Desclée, 1981, 417-23.

Pesch, Rudolf. "Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate." *Bib* 48 (1967) 395-420.

—, *Das Markusevangelium* I. HTKNT. Freibourg: Herder, 1976.

Phoutrides, E. A. "The Chorus of Euripides." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 27 (1916) 77-170.

Piper, Ronald A. *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*. SNTSMS 61. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.

Polag, Athanasius. *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle*. Neukirche-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979.

Pomykala, Kenneth. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*. SBL Early Judaism and its Literature 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Powell, Mark Allen. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Prabhu, George M. Soares. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*. AnBib 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.

Preisker, Herbert and Siegfried Schulz. "πρόβατον." *TDNT* VI 689-92.

Priest, J. "A Note on the Messianic Banquet" in Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, 222-38.

Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative*. Janua Linguarum 108. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.

Pryke, E. J. *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel*. SNTSMS 33. Cambridge: University Press, 1978.

Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought*. SNTSMS 41. Cambridge: University Press, 1980.

—, "The Setting of Matthean Anti-judaism" in Richardson, *Anti-Judaism*, 181-200.

Reinhardt, Wolfgang. "The Population Size of Jerusalem and the Numerical Growth of the Christian Church" in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol 4. Palestinian Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 237-65.

Rembry, Jean G. "Le thème du berger dans l'oeuvre d'Ezechiel." *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum* 11 (1960/61) 113-44.

Rengstorf, Karl. "διδάσκω κτλ." *TDNT* II 135-48.

Rey-Coquais, J.-P. "Syrie-Romaine, de Pompée à Dioclétien." *Journal of Roman Studies* 68 (1978) 44-73.

Rhoads, David and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Richardson, Peter and David Granskou (eds.). *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 1. *Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986.

Riches, John. *Matthew*. New Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Riesenfeld, Harald. *Jésus Transfiguré: L'Arrière-Plan de récit evangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur*. ASNU 16. København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1947.

Roberts J. J. M. "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations" in Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah*, 39-51.

Rothfuchs, W. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. WMANT V 8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969.

Russell, E. A. "The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel." SE VII=*TU* 126 (1982) 428-42.

Ryan, Thomas J. "Matthew 15:29-31: An Overlooked Summary." *Horizons* 5 (1978) 31-42.

Sabbe M. " John 10 and its relationship to the Synoptic Gospels" in Beutler and Fortna, *The Shepherd Discourse*, 75-93.

Safrai, Zeev. "The Description of the Land of Israel in Josephus' Works" in Louis H. Feldman and Hata Gohei (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989, 295-324.

Saito, Tadashi. *Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe xxiii, Bd. 100. Bern/Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1977.

Saldarini, Anthony J. "Boundaries and Polemics in the Gospel of Matthew." *Biblical Interpretation* 3 (1995) 239-65.

—, "Delegitimation of Leaders in Matthew 23." *CBQ* 54 (1992) 659-80.

—, "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict" in D. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community*, 38-61.

—, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Sand, Alexander. *Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus*. Biblische Untersuchungen II. Regensberg: Friedrich Pustet, 1974.

—, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium*. Erträge der Forschung 275. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM, 1985.

—, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM, 1990.

—, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63BCE – 66CE*. London: SCM, 1992.

—, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. SNTSMS 9. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Sanders, E. P. and Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press, 1989.

Sattherthwaite, Philip E. et al. (eds.). *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretaion of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

Schelkle, Karl Hermann. "Die 'Selbstverfluchung' Israels nach Matthäus 27,23-25" in Eckert, *Antijudaismus*, 148-156.

Schenk, Wolfang. *Die Sprache des Matthäus: Die Texte-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostructurellen Relationen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

—, "Den Menschen Mt 9:8." *ZNW* 54 (1963) 272-75.

Schiffman, Lawrence. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. "ἔθνος." *TDNT* III 369-72.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten." SE I=*TU* 1963, 622-39.

—, *The Gospel according to St. John.* 3 Vols. New York: 1968-1982.
—, "Matthew's Gospel as a Test Case for Hermeneutical Reflections" in Bauer and Powell, *Treasures*, 251-69.
Schneider, Gerhard. "ἀκολουθέω." *EDNT* I 49-52.
—, *Die Passion Jesu nach den drei älteren Evangelien.* Biblische Handbibliothek xi. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1973.
Schneider, Johannes. "ἀναβαίνω." *TDNT* I 519-22.
—, "σταυρόω." *TDNT* VII 572-84.
Schnider, Franz. *Jesus der Prophet.* OBO 2. Universitätsverlag Freiburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
Schniedewind, William M. *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1-17.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
Schoeps, H. J. "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde" in *idem*, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1950, 126-143
Schönle, Johannes. *Jesus und die Juden. Die Theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11.* BBET 17. Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1982.
Schottroff, Luise. "Das geschundene Volk und die Arbeit in der Ernte Gottes nach dem Matthäusevangeliums" in L. and W. Schottroff (eds.), *Mitarbeiter der Schöpfung.* Munich: Kaiser, 1983, 149-206.
Schüpphaus J. *Die Psalmen Salomos: Eine Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts.* ALGHJ 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135).* Rev. and ed., G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black. 4 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979-87.
Schürmann, Heinz. "Mt 10, 5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes" in *idem, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien.* Beiträge Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1967, 137-49.
Schuler, Philip. *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
Schulz, Anton. *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen. Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentliche Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik.* SANT 6. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1962.
Schulz, Siegfried. *Die Stunde der Botschaft. Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten.* Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970.
Schweizer, Eduard. "Er wird Nazoräer heissen" in *idem*, *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963.* Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963.
—, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde.* SBS 71. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
—, "Matthew' s Church" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 129-55.
—, "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew." *NTS* 16 (1970) 213-30.
Segal, Alan F. "Matthew's Jewish Voice" in D. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community*, 3-37.
Segbroeck, F. van. "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents" in Didier, *L'évangile*, 107-30.
—, "Jésus rejeté par sa patrie." *Bib* 49 (1968) 167-98.

—, "Le scandale de l'incroyance: la signification de Mt 13:35." *ETL* 41 (1965) 344-72.
Segbroeck, F. van et al. (eds). *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck.* BETL. Leuven: University Press, 1992, Vol. 2.
Selman, Martin J. "Messianic Mysteries" in Satterthwaite et al., *Lord's Anointed*, 281-302.
Senior, Donald P. "Between Two Worlds: Gentile and Jewish Christians in Matthew's Gospel." *CBQ* 61 (1999) 1-23.
—, "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as a Test Case" in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Scriptures in the* Gospels. BETL 131. Leuven: University Press, 1997, 89-115.
—, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study*. BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.
—, "The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew" in Didier, *L'évangile* 343-57.
Schuler, Philip. *A Genre for the Gospels. The Biographical Character of Matthew.* Piladelphia: Fortress, 1982.
Sider, John W. "The Meaning of *Parabolê* in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists." *Bib* 62 (1981) 453-70.
Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the gospel of Matthew.* SNTSMS 88. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.
—, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
—, "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles." *JSNT* 57 (1995) 19-48.
Slingerland, H. Dixon. "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Mathew's Gospel." *JSNT* 3 (1979) 18-28.
Smallwood, E. M. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian.* SJLA 20. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
Smith, Christopher R. "Literary Evidences of a Fivefold Structure in the Gospel of Matthew." *NTS* 43 (1997) 540-51.
Smith, Dennis E. "Messianic Banquet." *ABD* IV 88-91.
—, "The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered" in Birger Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991, 64-73.
Smith, Morton. *Jesus the Magician.* New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
Springer, Mary Doyle. *A Rhetoric of Literary Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
Stanton, Graham. "The Communities of Matthew." *Int* 46 (1992) 371-91.
—, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
—, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism." *BJRL* 66 (1984) 264-84.
—, (ed.). *The Interpretation of Matthew.* Issues in Religion and Theology 3. London: SPCK, 1983.
—, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. SNTSMS 27. Cambridge: University Press, 1974.
—, "Matthew: βίβλος, εὐαγγέλιον,or βίος?" in F. Van Segbroeck et al. (eds.) *The Four Gospels*. Vol. 2. 1187-1201.
—, "Matthew 11:28-30: Comfortable Words?" in Stanton, *New People*, 364-77.
—, "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus" in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1983, 273-87.

—, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-80" in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Series 11 25:3. Principat. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985, 1889-1951.
—, "Revisiting Matthew's Communities." *SBL 1994 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994, 9-23.
—, "Salvation Proclaimed: X. Matthew 11:28-30: Comfortable Words?" *ET* 94 (1982) 3-8.
Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. WMANT 23. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
Stemberger, Günter. "*Galilee* – Land of Salvation?" in W. D. Davies, *Land*, 409-438.
Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament*. 2nd Ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
—, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mathew 1-2" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 56-66.
Strathmann, H. et al. "λαός." *TDNT* IV 29-57.
Strecker, Georg. *Die Bergpredigt: Ein Exegetischer Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
—, "The Concept of History in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 67-84.
—, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. 3. Auf. FRLANT 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1926.
Suhl, Alfred. "Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium." *ZNW* 59 (1968) 57-81.
—, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Auspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965.
Syreeni, Kari. *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount: A Procedural Analysis of Matthew's redactional activity*. Part I: Methodology & Compositional Analysis. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 44. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
Tagawa, Kenzo. *Miracles et évangile: La pensée personelle de l'évangéliste Marc*. Etudes d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 62. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.
Tannehill, Robert. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. 2 Vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986, 1990.
Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Origin of Jesus Messiah (Matt. 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions." *JBL* 96 (1977) 523-35.
Teeple, Howard M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 10. Philadelphia: SBL, 1957.
Theissen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
—, *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
—, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Thompson, W. G. *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Matthew: 17:22-18:35*. AnBib 44. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970.
—, "Reflections on the Composition of Mt. 8:1-9:34." *CBQ* 33 (1971) 365-88.
Thyen, Hartwig. *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
Thysman, Raymond. *Communauté et Directives Ethiques: La catéchèse de Matthieu: théologie morale du Nouveau Testament essai de synthèse*. Gembloux: Editions Duculot, 1974.
Tooley, Wilfred. "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus." *NovT* 7 (1964/5) 15-25.
Townshend, John T. "The Gospel of John and the Jews: The Story of a Religious Divorce" in Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York: Paulist, 1979, 72-97.
Tracey, Robyn. "Syria" in D. Gill and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Vol. 2. *Graeco-Roman Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, 223-78.
Trilling, Wolfgang. "Der Einzug in Jerusalem Mt. 21:1-17" in J. Blinzler et al. (eds.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963, 303-9.
—, "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus." *BZ* 3 (1959) 271-89.
—, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. 3. Auf. SANT 10. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.
Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
Turner, C. H. "Notes and Studies: Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel, Cont'd. V: The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd." *JTS* 26 (1925) 225-40.
Turner, John D. "The History of Religions Background of John 10" in Beutler and Fortna, *The Shepherd Discourse*, 33-52.
Twelftree, Graham. *Jesus: The Miracle Worker*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
—, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1993.
Tyson, J. B. "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 30 (1984) 574-83.
Van Tilborg, Sjef. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew*. London: SCM, 1983.
Vernant, Jean-Pierre and Pierre Vidal-Naquet. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. New York: Zone Books, 1988.
Verseput, Donald J. "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity." *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995, 102-16.
—, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1986.
Via, Dan O., Jr. "Matthew on the Understandability of the Parables." *JBL* 84 (1965) 430-32.
—, *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
Vledder, Evert-Jan. *Conflict in the Miracle Stories: A Socio-Exegetical Study of Matthew 8 and 9*. JSNTSup 152. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Vögtle, Anton. *Messias und Gottessohn: Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts– und Kindheitsgeschichte.* Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1966.
Wacholder, B. Z. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature.* Cincinnati: Jewish Insititute of Religion, 1974.
Walker, Rolf. *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium.* FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
Walter, N. "σπλαγχνίζομαι." *EDNT* III 265.
—, "σπλάγχνον." *EDNT* III 265-6.
Watson, D. F. "People, Crowd" in Joel Green et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992, 605-9.
Weaver Dorothy J. *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis.* JSNTMS 38. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
Weber, Kathleen. "The Image of the Sheep and the Goats in Matthew 25:31-46." *CBQ* 59 (1997) 657-78.
Weiss, H.-F. "διδάσκω κτλ." *EDNT* I 317-19.
—, "φαρισαῖος." *TDNT* IX 35-48.
Werner, Eric. "'Hosanna' in the Gospels." *JBL* 65 (1946) 97-122.
White, L. Michael. "Crisis Management and Boundary Maintenance: The Social Location of the Matthean Community" in Balch, *Matthean Community,* 211-47.
Wilkens, Michael. *Discipleship in the Ancient World and Matthew's Gospel.* 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
Wilson, Stephen G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Willmes, Bernd. *Die sogenannte Hirtenallegorie Ez 34: Studien zum Bild des Hirten im Alten Testament.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984.
Windisch, Hans. *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.
Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in Gospel Tradition.* SNTSMS 7. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.
Winter, Paul. *On the Trial of Jesus.* 2nd Ed. SJ 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.
Wolff, Hans Walter. *Jesaja im Urchristentum.* 4 Auf. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1984.
Wrede, Wilhelm. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständis des Markusevangeliums.* 3 Auf. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (1901) 1963.
Zahn, Theodor. *Introduction to the New Testament.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909. Vol. II.
Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel II.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
Zingg, Paul. *Das Wachsen der Kirche.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
Zizemer, Osmar. *Das Verhältnis zwischen Jesus and Volk im Markusevangelium.* Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians Universität Munich, 1983.
Zmijewski, Josef. "πλῆθος." *EDNT* III 103-05.
Zumstein, Jean. *La condition de croyant dans l'évangile selon Matthieu.* OBO 16. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1977.

INDEX OF REFERENCES

1 *Hebrew Scriptures*

2 *New Testament*

Mark

3 *Jewish Literature*

4 *Christian Literature*

5 *Classical Literature*

INDEX OF AUTHORS

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

ISSN 0167-9732

2. Strobel, A. *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdische-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2 ff.* 1961. ISBN 90 04 01582 5
16. Pfitzner, V.C. *Paul and the Agon Motif.* 1967. ISBN 90 04 01596 5
27. Mussies, G. *The Morphology of Koine Greek As Used in the Apocalypse of St. John.* A Study in Bilingualism. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02656 8
28. Aune, D.E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03341 6
29. Unnik, W.C. van. *Sparsa Collecta.* The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 1. Evangelia, Paulina, Acta. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03660 1
31. Unnik, W.C. van. *Sparsa Collecta.* The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 3. Patristica, Gnostica, Liturgica. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06262 9
34. Hagner, D.A. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome.* 1973. ISBN 90 04 03636 9
37. Reiling, J. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy.* A Study of The Eleventh Mandate. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03771 3
43. Clavier, H. *Les variétés de la pensée biblique et le problème de son unité.* Esquisse d'une théologie de la Bible sur les textes originaux et dans leur contexte historique. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04465 5
47. Baarda, T., A.F.J. Klijn & W.C. van Unnik (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica.* I. Studia ad Novum Testamentum Praesertim Pertinentia a Sociis Sodalicii Batavi c.n. Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus Anno MCMLXXVI Quintum Lustrum Feliciter Complentis Suscepta. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05685 8
48. Baarda, T., A.F.J. Klijn & W.C. van Unnik (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica.* II. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05686 6
50. Bousset, D.W. *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien.* Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Hrsg. von A.F. Verheule. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05845 1
52. Garland, D.E. *The Intention of Matthew 23.* 1979. ISBN 90 04 05912 1
53. Moxnes, H. *Theology in Conflict.* Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06140 1
56. Skarsaune, O. *The Proof From Prophecy.* A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-type, Provenance, Theological Profile. 1987. ISBN 90 04 07468 6
59. Wilkins, M.J. *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel, as Reflected in the Use of the Term 'Mathetes'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08689 7
64. Sterling, G.E. *Historiography and Self-Definition.* Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09501 2
65. Botha, J.E. *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman.* A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09505 5
66. Kuck, D.W. *Judgment and Community Conflict.* Paul's Use of Apologetic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09510 1
67. Schneider, G. *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie.* Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09555 1
68. Seifrid, M.A. *Justification by Faith.* The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09521 7

69. Newman, C.C. *Paul's Glory-Christology*. Tradition and Rhetoric. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09463 6
70. Ireland, D.J. *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*. An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16: 1-13. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09600 0
71. Elliott, J.K. *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. An Edition of C.H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" together with other comparable studies. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09767 8
72. Chilton, B. *A Feast of Meanings*. Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09949 2
73. Guthrie, G.H. *The Structure of Hebrews*. A Text-Linguistic Analysis. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09866 6
74. Bormann, L., K. Del Tredici & A. Standhartinger (eds.) *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World*. Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi.1994. ISBN 90 04 10049 0
75. Piper, R.A. (ed.) *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*. Current Studies on Q. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09737 6
76. Pedersen, S. (ed.) *New Directions in Biblical Theology*. Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 16-19 September 1992. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10120 9
77. Jefford, C.N. (ed.) *The* Didache *in Context*. Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10045 8
78. Bormann, L. *Philippi – Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10232 9
79. Peterlin, D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10305 8
80. Jones, I.H. *The Matthean Parables*. A Literary and Historical Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10181 0
81. Glad, C.E. *Paul and Philodemus*. Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy. 1995 ISBN 90 04 10067 9
82. Fitzgerald, J.T. (ed.) *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech*. Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10454 2
83. Tilborg, S. van. *Reading John in Ephesus*. 1996. 90 04 10530 1
84. Holleman, J. *Resurrection and Parousia*. A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10597 2
85. Moritz, T. *A Profound Mystery*. The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10556 5
86. Borgen, P. *Philo of Alexandria - An Exegete for His Time*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10388 0
87. Zwiep, A.W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10897 1
88. Wilson, W.T. *The Hope of Glory*. Education and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Colossians. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10937 4
89. Peterson, W.L., J.S. Vos & H.J. de Jonge (eds.). *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical*. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10380 5
90. Malherbe, A.J., F.W. Norris & J.W. Thompson (eds.). *The Early Church in Its Context*. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10832 7
91. Kirk, A. *The Composition of the Sayings Source*. Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11085 2
92. Vorster, W.S. *Speaking of Jesus*. Essays on Biblical Language, Gospel Narrative and the Historical Jesus. Edited by J. E. Botha. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10779 7
93. Bauckham, R. *The Fate of Dead*. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11203 0

94. Standhartinger, A. *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Intention des Kolosserbriefs.* ISBN 90 04 11286 3 *(In preparation)*
95. Oegema, G.S. *Für Israel und die Völker.* Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11297 9
96. Albl, M.C. *"And Scripture Cannot Be Broken".* The Form and Function of the Early Christian *Testimonia* Collections. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11417 3
97. Ellis, E.E. *Christ and the Future in New Testament History.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11533 1
98. Chilton, B. & C.A. Evans, (eds.) *James the Just and Christian Origins.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11550 1
99. Horrell, D.G. & C.M. Tuckett (eds.) *Christology, Controversy and Community.* New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11679 6
100. Jackson-McCabe, M.A. *Logos and Law in the Letter of James.* The Law of Nature, the Law of Moses and the Law of Freedom. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11994 9
101. Wagner, J.R. *Herald of the Good News.* Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans 2001. ISBN 90 04 11691 5
102. Cousland, J.R.C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12177 3
103. Dunderberg, I., C. Tuckett and K. Syreeni. *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts.* Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12359 8